Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 88-257
H. R. 9140

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H. R. 9140. 1
Digest of Public Law 88-257 2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 9140

Nov. 15, 1963	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 9140. H. Report No. 902. Print of bill and report.
Nov. 19, 1963	House passed H. R. 9140 without amendment.
Nov. 20, 1963	H. R. 9140 was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
	Insertion of general provision (Sec. 408) concerning foreign currencies.
Dec. 4, 1963	Senate subcommittee approved H. R. 9140 for full committee consideration.
Dec. 5, 1963	Senate committee reported H. R. 9140 with amendments. S. Report No. 746. Print of bill and report.
Dec. 6, 1963	Sen. Proxmire submitted proposed amendments to H. R. 9140.
Dec. 9, 1963	Senate passed H. R. 9140 with amendments.
	Senate conferees were appointed.
	Print of bill as passed by Senate.
Dec. 10, 1963	House conferees were appointed.
	Summary of general provisions of bill as passed by Senate.
Dec. 11, 1963	House received conference report on H. R. 9140. H. Report No. 1027. Print of report.
Dec. 12, 1963	Both Houses agreed to the conference report.
Dec. 31, 1963	Approved: Public Law 88-257.

88TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 902

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

NOVEMBER 15, 1963.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 9140]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for certain Civil Functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Delaware River Basin Commission, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Estimates considered by the Committee are those included in the budget document and in House Documents numbered 89, 105, 109, 125, 128, 134, 166, and 173. These estimates total $4,561,747,000. The Committee recommends appropriations of $4,276,116,400, a reduction of $285,630,600 in the budget estimates and a decrease of $1,258,586,210 below appropriations for fiscal year 1963.

A comparative table showing appropriations for 1963, estimates and amounts recommended for 1964 appears at the end of this report. A brief summary of the bill by major activities is as follows:

Activity	Budget estimate 1964 (as amended)	Recommended by the committee	Change from budget estimate
Cemeterial expenses	$10, 846, 000	$10, 800, 000	—$46, 000
Rivers and harbors and flood control	1, 086, 816, 000	1, 055, 782, 700	—31, 033, 300
The Panama Canal	33, 715, 000	31, 500, 000	—2, 215, 000
Bureau of Reclamation	370, 347, 000	348, 146, 700	—22, 200, 300
Power agencies of the Department of Interior	76, 075, 000	54, 700, 000	—21, 375, 000
Atomic Energy Commission	2, 849, 645, 000	2, 688, 169, 000	—161, 476, 000
Tennessee Valley Authority	48, 284, 000	46, 000, 000	—2, 284, 000
Delaware River Basin Commission	156, 000	155, 000	—1, 000
Public Works acceleration	45, 000, 000		—45, 000, 000
Indefinite appropriations	40, 863, 000	40, 863, 000	
Total	4, 561, 747, 000	4, 276, 116, 400	—285, 630, 600

NEW STARTS AND UNBUDGETED ITEMS

The budget estimates included 34 new construction starts for the Corps of Engineers and 8 for the Bureau of Reclamation, a total of 42. The Committee is recommending funding of all but one of these and has added 18 for the Corps of Engineers, making a total of 59 new construction starts. In addition, the Committee recommends funds for 30 unbudgeted surveys, and for the initiation of planning on 17 unbudgeted projects.

COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN STUDIES

The budget estimates for both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation reflect an increasing emphasis on the comprehensive river basin planning approach to the water resources problems of the country. During the course of the hearings it became clearly evident that the estimates had been put together hurriedly with little attention having been given to the matter of coordination between agencies, the selection of basins to be studied, or the scope and ultimate costs of the program. The Committee was given assurances that efforts are underway to correct these deficiencies in presentation of the budget program for fiscal year 1965. This will be expected.

As stated in the report on the bill for fiscal year 1963, the Committee is convinced that this approach to the water resources problems will evolve as the logical and most effective means of assuring the wisest use of our water resources. It would like to repeat, however, that it does not expect this program to become an excuse for requests for additional personnel and is convinced that realignment of responsi-

bilities where necessary will serve to handle the workload. Actions taken by the Committee on the requests for fiscal year 1964 are directed in part at enforcing this restriction.

TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Cemeterial Expenses

Appropriation, 1963	$10, 333, 000
Estimate, 1964	10, 846, 000
Recommended, 1964	10, 800, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+467, 000
Estimate, 1964	−46, 000

The funds provided under this heading are to cover the cost of interments in National Cemeteries, grave markers, and the development and maintenance of cemetery properties. The minor general reduction made by the Committee includes 10 percent of the pay act cost increase.

Corps of Engineers—Civil

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1963	$18, 100, 000
Estimate, 1964	20, 020, 000
Recommended, 1964	18, 000, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	−100, 000
Estimate, 1964	−2, 020, 000

The funds provided under this heading are allocated to surveys and activities listed in the table which follows:

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Alabama:		
Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga	Navigation	$10, 000
Alaska:		
Clarks Point	Flood control	20, 000
Dry Straits-Wrangell Narrows	Navigation	42, 000
Hoonah Harbor	do	17, 000
Kake Harbor	do	17, 000
Knik and Turnagain Arms	do	45, 000
Knik River	Flood control	50, 000
Rampart Canyon	Special	197, 000
Seward	Flood control	15, 000
Tenana River at Nenana	do	19, 000
Valdez Glacier streams	do	5, 000
Arizona:		
Gila River-New River and Phoenix	do	20, 000
Arkansas:		
Arkansas River pumped storage	Special	50, 000
Lee Creek, Ark. and Okla	Flood control	34, 000
Little Rock Levee	do	8, 000
St. Francis River Basin, Ark. and Mo	Comprehensive.	25, 000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	do	250, 000
Verdigris River-Bird Creek, Ark. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.)		

Project	Type of project	General investigations
California:		
Alhambra Creek	Flood control	$40,000
Atherton Creek	do	30,000
Cache Creek	do	21,000
Caliente Creek	do	11,000
Cosumnes River	do	15,000
Coxo Anchorage	Navigation	30,000
Cucamonga Creek	Flood control	30,000
Eel River	do	90,000
Fairfield and vicinity	do	[1] 25,000
Guadalupe River	do	40,100
Isabella Reservoir, Kern River	do	40,000
Jack and Simmerly Sloughs	do	15,000
Lyle and Warm Creeks	do	12,000
Merced County streams	do	30,000
Pajaro River	do	54,000
Port Hueneme Harbor	Navigation	[1] 20,000
Poso-Deer-White Stream group	Flood control	35,000
Richardson Bay streams	do	15,000
Russian River	do	20,000
Russian River, Jenner	Navigation	24,500
Sacramento-San Joaquin region	Flood control	12,000
Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta	Navigation and flood control.	[1] 50,000
San Diego Harbor	Navigation	15,400
San Diego River	Flood control	5,000
San Francisco Bay area survey	Special	90,000
San Luis Rey River	Flood control	30,000
San Mateo streams	do	35,000
Santa Barbara streams	do	[1] 25,000
Sweetwater River	do	10,000
Tia Juana River	do	35,000
Upper Warm Creek	do	[1] 40,000
Yuba River, Bullards Bar	do	9,400
Colorado:		
Animas River, Colo. and N. Mex	do	15,700
Arkansas River above Martin Dam	do	60,000
South Platte River	do	35,000
Connecticut:		
Coastal rivers, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Maine.	do	70,000
Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., N.H.	Comprehensive.	250,000
Park River, Hartford	Flood control	50,000
Delaware:		
Delaware Bay-Chesapeake Bay Waterway, Del., Md., and Va.	Navigation	35,000
District of Columbia:		
Anacostia River, D.C. and Md	Flood control	40,000
Potomac and Anacostia Rivers (debris)	Navigation	6,000
Florida:		
Canal 13-Middle River	Flood control	2,000
Econlockhatchee River	do	20,000
Escambia River, Fla. and Ala	Navigation	20,000
Everglades National Park	do	75,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Florida—Continued		
Intracoastal Waterway-St. Marks River-Tampa Bay.	Navigation	$60,000
Martin County	Flood control	40,000
Phillippi Creek	do	6,000
Pithlachascotee River	Navigation	11,000
Santa Rosa Island-Sabine Bay	do	15,000
Tampa Harbor-Hillsboro Bay	do	10,000
Georgia:		
Altamaha-Oconee-Ocmulgee Rivers	Flood control	45,000
Chattahoochee River, Columbus, Ga	do	25,000
Satilla-St. Marys-Suwannee, Ga. and Fla	do	7,500
Hawaii:		
Coast of Hawaiian Islands	Navigation	83,800
Iao Stream	Flood control	7,500
Kawaihae Harbor	Navigation	16,000
Palolo and Manoa Valleys	Flood control	42,000
Idaho:		
Boise River at Boise	do	19,500
Upper Snake River, Idaho and Wyo	do	123,900
Illinois:		
Big Muddy River	Comprehensive.	115,000
Fox River, Ill. and Wisconsin	Flood control	31,500
Hammond-Whiting-East Chicago, Ill. and Ind.	Navigation	25,000
Illinois Waterway, Brandon Road lock-Sag Junction.	do	29,400
Wabash River, Ill. and Ind	Comprehensive.	250,000
Indiana:		
Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio	Flood control	40,000
Michigan City Harbor	Navigation	2,400
White River	Flood control	144,900
Whitewater River, Ind. and Ohio	do	25,000
Iowa:		
Big Sioux River at Sioux City	do	[1] 10,000
Des Moines River	do	25,000
Duck Creek	do	15,000
Fort Madison	Navigation	25,000
Little Sioux River	Flood control	30,000
Nishnabotna River	do	55,500
Skunk and Squaw Creek	do	[1] 25,000
Kansas:		
Arkansas River	do	35,000
Arkansas River, Hutchinson-Cimmaron River, Kans. and Okla.	do	19,000
Big Creek, Hays	do	13,500
Cimarron River, N. Mex., Okla., Colo., and Kans.	do	60,000
Lyon Creek watershed	do	10,000
Kentucky:		
Big Sandy River, Ky., W. Va., and Va	do	40,300
Cumberland River-Bunches Creek	do	19,000
Green and Barren Rivers	Navigation	35,000
Humphrey Creek to Columbus	Flood control	30,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Kentucky—Continued		
Kentucky River	Flood control	$75,000
Kinniconick Creek	do	17,000
Licking River	do	40,000
Little Sandy River-Tygarts Creek	do	20,000
Rockcastle River	do	8,000
Salt River	do	16,000
Upper Cumberland River	do	25,000
Louisiana:		
Calcasieu River	Navigation	15,000
Cypress Bayou-Caddo Lake, La. and Tex	Flood control	15,000
Mermentau River	Navigation	22,100
Parish line canal, Kenner	do	22,000
Plaquemine lock freshwater	do	15,000
Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.	Comprehensive.	250,000
Tangipahoa River	Flood control	20,000
Teche-Vermillion Basin	do	18,500
Maine:		
Androscoggin River, Maine and N.H	do	85,000
Biddeford Pool Harbor	Navigation	6,500
Calf Island	do	7,000
Owls Head Harbor	do	8,000
Prospect Harbor	do	6,000
Saco River, Maine and N.H	Flood control	50,000
St. John River Basin	Comprehensive.	85,000
Massachusetts:		
Edgartown Harbor	Navigation	5,000
Point Shirley to Deer Island (Winthrop Harbor)	do	[1] 3,000
Michigan:		
Clinton River	Flood control	25,000
Detroit River, Trenton Channel	Navigation	10,000
Grand River Basin	Comprehensive.	200,000
Great Lakes water levels, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, Illinois Minnesota, and Wisconsin.	Special	40,000
Huron River	Flood control	35,000
Lake Eric coast, Michigan and Ohio	Navigation	20,300
Les Cheneaux channels	do	8,500
Manistique and Indian Rivers	Flood control	30,000
St. Joseph River, Mich. and Ind	Navigation	19,000
St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind	Comprehensive.	100,000
Shore of Lake Huron	Navigation	25,000
Tittabawassee River	do	5,000
Minnesota:		
Bassett Creek	Flood control	15,000
Mississippi River headwaters reservoirs	Navigation	20,000
Pigs Eye Lake Harbor	do	15,000
Red River, Minn. and N. Dak	Flood control	65,000
Root River	do	15,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin, Minn., Ill., Mo., Iowa, Ind., S. Dak., and Wis.	Comprehensive.	325,000
Zumbro River, Minn	Flood control	30,000
Mississippi:		
Biloxi Harbor	Navigation	[1] 12,000
Big Black River	Comprehensive.	25,000
Pascagoula River Basin	do	150,000
Pearl River Basin, Miss. and La	do	100,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Missouri:		
Blue River, Kansas City, Mo. and Kans	Flood control	$15,000
Fishing River, Excelsior Springs	do	20,000
Gasconade River	do	15,000
Grand River	do	5,000
Little Blue River	do	[1] 10,000
Missouri River Basin, Mo., Mont., N. Dak., S. Dak., Colo., Nebr., Iowa, Minn., Kans., and Wyo.	Comprehensive.	250,000
Osage River, Mo. and Kans	Flood control	20,000
Platte River	do	22,700
Wears Creek, Jefferson City	do	[1] 10,000
Montana:		
Milk River-Beaver Creek	do	20,000
Missouri River, Garrison-Fort Peck	do	30,000
Nebraska:		
Big Blue River, Nebr. and Kans	do	30,000
Elkhorn River	do	10,000
Nemaha-Little Nemaha, Nebr. and Kans	do	15,000
Platte River	do	30,000
New Hampshire:		
Merrimack River, N.H. and Mass	do	100,000
New Jersey:		
Camden County streams	Flood control	[1] 50,000
Jersey Meadows, N.J. and N.Y	Special	150,000
Raritan River	Navigation	25,500
Townsend Inlet	do	10,000
New Mexico:		
Pecos River above Santa Rosa	Flood control	10,000
Rio Hondo and Rio Felix	do	25,000
Sante Fe River	do	30,000
New York:		
Buffalo Harbor-Niagara River debris	Navigation	5,000
Catskill Creek	Flood control	12,000
Cazenovia-Cayuga-Buffalo Creeks	do	48,000
Chittenango Creek	do	20,000
Cranberry and Long Pond	Navigation	[1] 15,000
Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa	Comprehensive.	150,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway	Special	[2] 250,000
Hamlin Beach State Park	Navigation	[1] 10,000
Hammond Cove entrance to Locust Point	do	[1] 10,000
Hempstead Harbor	do	[1] 20,000
Jamaica Bay	do	23,000
Lake Champlain Waterway, N.Y. and Vt	do	50,000
Lake Erie-Lake Ontario Waterway	Special	[2] 250,000
Mohawk River and Schoharie Creek	Flood control	18,000
New York and New Jersey channels, New York and New Jersey.	Navigation	40,000
New York Harbor drift collection, New York and New Jersey.	do	[1] 95,000
Ogdensburg Harbor	do	16,000
Tonawanda Creek	Flood control	45,000
Wilson Harbor	Navigation	[1] 8,000
North Carolina:		
Cape Fear River	Flood control	30,000
Cape Fear River above Wilmington	Navigation	25,500
Neuse River	Flood control	40,700
North Dakota:		
Missouri River, N. Dak., S. Dak., and Nebr.	do	24,500
Pembina River	do	15,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Ohio:		
Cuyahoga River	Flood control	$45,000
Hocking River	do	43,000
Lake Erie coast, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New York.	Navigation	35,000
Licking River	Flood control	12,000
Moxahala and Jonathan Creeks	do	35,000
Ohio River Basin, Ohio, Pa., Ind., Ky., Ill., Tenn., N.Y., Va., W. Va., and Md.	Comprehensive.	775,000
Sandusky River	Flood control	25,000
White Oak Creek	do	12,500
Oklahoma:		
Arkansas and Red Rivers to Oklahoma City	Navigation	95,000
Arkansas River-Eufaula Reservoir	do	37,000
Canadian River-Crutcho Creek	Flood control	8,200
Poteau River, Okla. and Ark	do	65,000
Red River, Sherwood Reservoir	do	35,000
Verdigris River-Bird Creek	Navigation	1,000
Oregon:		
Chetco River	do	7,000
Coos Bay deep-draft harbor	do	15,000
Coquille River	do	10,000
McKay Creek	Flood control	12,000
Siuslaw River	Navigation	9,000
Willamette River Basin	Comprehensive.	350,000
Pennsylvania:		
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	Flood control	17,000
Darby and Cobb Creeks	do	[1] 25,000
Delaware River channel dimensions, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware.	Navigation	33,000
Sawmill Run, Pittsburgh	Flood control	54,200
Susquehanna River Basin, Pa., Md., and N.Y.	Comprehensive.	330,000
South Carolina:		
Cooper River	Navigation	90,000
Santee River system, North Carolina and South Carolina.	do	20,000
South Dakota:		
Big Sioux River and tributaries	Flood control	[1] 20,000
Niobrara River (Gavins Point Reservoir)	do	[1] 40,000
Tennessee:		
Chicamauga Creek, Chattanooga	do	10,000
Texas:		
Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Louisiana, and Arkansas.	Special	50,000
Brazos River Basin	Comprehensive.	200,000
Cedar Bayou	Flood control	[1] 25,000
Clear Creek	do	20,000
Colorado River	Comprehensive.	215,000
Cypress Creek (San Jacinto and tributaries)	Flood control	[1] 15,000
Dickinson Bayou-Moses Lake	Navigation	10,000
Double Bayou	do	8,000
Edwards Underground Reservoir	Flood control	60,000
Freeport Harbor	Navigation	5,000
Goose Creek	Flood control	[1] 7,000
Guadalupe and San Antonio River	Navigation	20,000
Highland Bayou, Hitchcock	Flood control	30,000
Lake Wichita-Holiday Creek	do	9,500

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Texas—Continued		
Little Brazos River	Flood control	$45,000
Navasota River	do	75,000
Neches River	Comprehensive.	110,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway	Navigation	22,500
Sabine River Basin	Comprehensive.	115,000
San Bernard River	Flood control	[1] 15,000
San Felipe Creek	do	25,000
Texas coast	Special	250,000
Utah:		
Jordan River	Flood control	20,400
Little Dell	do	[1] 30,000
Mill and Pack Creeks, Moab	do	30,000
Willow Creek and Price River (Colorado River above Lee Ferry)	do	50,000
Virginia:		
Bonum Creek	do	[1] 10,000
Norfolk Harbor area	Navigation	36,600
Rappahannock River, Salem Church	Flood control	20,500
Washington:		
Columbia River navigation—extension to Rock Island Dam	Navigation	[1] 40,000
Eagle Harbor	do	12,000
Nooksack River	Flood control	23,000
Puget Sound area	Comprehensive.	150,000
Quilcene Bay	Navigation	15,000
Skagit River	Flood control	70,000
Snohomish River	do	100,000
Stillaguamish River	do	20,000
Stillaguamish River channels	do	20,000
Tacoma-Seattle ship channel	Navigation	35,000
West Virginia:		
Kanawha River Basin, W.Va., Va., and N.C.	Comprehensive.	150,000
West Fork River	Flood control	34,000
Wisconsin:		
Baraboo River	do	15,000
Fox River Basin	Comprehensive.	75,000
Manitowac Harbor	Navigation	[1] 5,000
Milwaukee River	Flood control	20,000
State Road-Ebner Coulee	do	20,000
Budget items not listed under States:		
General investigations:		
Surveys: Beach erosion studies		375,000
Special studies:		
Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Laws 566, 984, etc.).		300,000
Hurricane studies		387,000
General reduction to be applied against basin surveys.		—1,000,000
Collection and study of basic data:		
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)		280,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).		480,000
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).		210,000
International water studies		85,000
Flood plain studies		715,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 10.

Project	Type of project	General investigations
Budget items not listed under States—Continued		
Research and development:		
Beach erosion development studies		$820,000
Hydrologic studies		185,000
Engineering studies		1,365,000
Plan formulation and evaluation studies		100,000
Mississippi Basin model:		
(1) Construction		461,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study.		210,000
Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.		1,200,000
General reduction due to slippage		−1,100,000
Total, general investigations		18,000,000

[1] Unbudgeted.
[2] Includes increase above budget.

REDUCTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

Comprehensive River Basin Surveys.—The total cost of comprehensive river basin surveys as presented in the budget is $4,995,000. The Committee recommends $3,995,000, a reduction of $1,000,000. As pointed out previously in this report it is evident that the enthusiasm to get this program underway has outrun the recognition of the need for careful planning and coordination between agencies. The amount which the Committee is recommending provides an increase of $1,042,000 above the amounts available in fiscal year 1963. None of these funds are to be used for the employment of new personnel but are for the purpose of covering the increased costs of the program including the salaries and expenses of present employees who may be transferred to this function.

Cooper River Survey, South Carolina.—In addition to the $90,000 budgeted for this survey, the Committee directs that an additional $60,000 of funds available under the General Investigations heading shall be used for the purpose of expanding and expediting the study of possible solutions to the silting problem in the Charleston Harbor.

Beach erosion studies.—The additional $25,000 provided in this item is for the beach erosion control study at Grand Isle, Louisiana.

Flood plain studies.—Within the amount provided under this heading $20,000 is to be used for the Chester Creek, Pennsylvania, flood plain study.

Nuclear Explosives.—The Committee has applied a reduction of $715,000 to the budget estimate of $1,915,000 for Corps of Engineer participation in the nuclear explosives program of the Atomic Energy Commission. The amount allowed is $1,200,000, an increase of $709,000 above the fiscal year 1963 level. It is the Committee's opinion that this increase will be adequate in view of the fact that there will probably be some slowdown in this developmental program for use of nuclear explosives on excavation projects, due in part to provisions of the Nuclear Test-ban Treaty. In addition, the Committee fails to see why this peaceful use program needs to be hurried to the extent indicated by the budget.

General reduction due to slippage.—The Committee has applied a general reduction of $1,100,000. Estimates for new surveys, including those added by the Committee were for the most part on a full-year basis. Since there will be only about 6 months working time on these surveys there should be substantial slippage in obligating funds. In addition there was carried into fiscal 1964 from 1963 a balance of approximately $1,400,000 over the amount contemplated in the budget.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1963	$792, 870, 500
Estimate, 1964	819, 316, 000
Recommended, 1964	798, 282, 700
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+5, 412, 200
Estimate, 1964	−21, 033, 300

The following table shows each project for which funds are recommended for advance engineering and design (planning) and for actual construction:

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Alabama:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Holt lock and dam	$7,700,000		$7,700,000	
Jones Bluff lock and dam		$250,000		$250,000
Millers Ferry lock and dam	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Paint Rock River	231,000		231,000	
Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (National wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia)	500,000			
Alaska:				
Snettisham power project		225,000		225,000
Arizona:				
Alamo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir		200,000		200,000
Tucson diversion channel	1,750,000		1,750,000	
Arkansas:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
(*a*) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000	
(*b*) Navigation locks and dams	11,000,000		11,000,000	
Beaver Reservoir	10,300,000		10,300,000	
Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri	567,000		567,000	
Dardanelle lock and dam	20,000,000		20,000,000	

De Queen Reservoir		250,000		250,000
Degray Reservoir	2,350,000		2,350,000	
Dierks Reservoir		150,000		150,000
Gilliam Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Greers Ferry Reservoir	2,917,000		2,917,000	
Maniece Bayou			200,000	
Millwood Reservoir	15,600,000		15,600,000	
Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	100,000		100,000	
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Ozark lock and dam		285,000		285,000
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	300,000		300,000	
California:				
Alameda Creek		250,000		250,000
Bear Creek	600,000		600,000	
Buchanan Dam (Chowchilla River Basin)				125,000
Comanche Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000	
Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
Dana Point Harbor				95,000
Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement		150,000		200,000
Hidden Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000	
Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	610,000		610,000	
Marina del Rey (Playa) Harbor	1,350,000		1,350,000	
Merced River Reservoirs		25,000		25,000
New Hogan Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000	
New Melones Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Noyo River and Harbor		150,000		150,000
Oroville Reservoir	8,000,000		4,555,000	
Redondo Beach, King Harbor	950,000		950,000	
Redwood Creek		50,000		50,000

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
California—Continued				
Redwood City Harbor			$660,000	
Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	$335,000		335,000	
Sacramento River bank protection	700,000		700,000	
Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,500,000		70,000	
Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	800,000		800,000	
Sacramento River deep water ship channel	350,000		350,000	
Sacramento River flood control project	900,000		840,000	
Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000	
Santa Cruz Harbor (Sand Bypassing Plant)	100,000		100,000	
Tahchevah Creek			200,000	
Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)	122,000		122,000	
Walnut Creek	100,000		500,000	
West Fork Reservoir		$80,000		$80,000
Colorado:				
Trinidad Reservoir		86,000		86,000
Connecticut:				
Ansonia-Derby		100,000		100,000
Black Rock Reservoir		150,000		150,000
Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000
Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments)		60,000		60,000
East Branch Reservoir	685,000		685,000	
Hancock Brook Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Hop Brook Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Northfield Brook Reservoir	900,000		900,000	

Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement)	32,000		32,000	
Stamford	300,000		300,000	
Sucker Brook Reservoir		90,000		90,000
West Thompson Reservoir	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Delaware:				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes)	500,000		500,000	
Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	831,000		831,000	
Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	11,000,000		11,000,000	
Florida:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Apalachicola River channel improvement	500,000		500,000	
Bakers Haulover Inlet	204,000		204,000	
Canaveral Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Central and southern Florida	14,000,000		14,000,000	
Cross Florida barge canal	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Intracoastal Waterway:				
(*a*) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	950,000		950,000	
(*b*) Jacksonville to Miami	2,085,000		2,085,000	
Miami Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	9,000		9,000	
Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	575,000		575,000	
Georgia:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Carters Dam	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin	300,000		300,000	

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Georgia—Continued				
Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C.			$270,000	
Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
West Point Reservoir		$350,000		$350,000
Hawaii:				
Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000
Kahului Harbor (breakwater)	$800,000		800,000	
Wailoa Stream	766,000		766,000	
Idaho:				
Boise Valley	409,000		409,000	
Dworshak Reservoir (Bruces Eddy Reservoir)	6,000,000		6,000,000	
Ririe Reservoir		375,000		375,000
Illinois:				
Calumet River, bridges	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:				
(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)	500,000		500,000	
(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Carlyle Reservoir	5,700,000		5,700,000	
Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
Clear Lake Special Drainage District		51,000		51,000
East St. Louis and vicinity	300,000		300,000	
Freeport		100,000		100,000

Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	6,100,000		6,100,000	
Indian Grave Drainage District		100,000		100,000
Kaskaskia River		300,000		300,000
McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District		80,000		80,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
(*a*) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000	
(*b*) Chain of Rocks	400,000		400,000	
Mount Carmel	300,000		300,000	
Oakley Reservoir		200,000		200,000
Rend Lake Reservoir		501,000		501,000
Richland Creek		100,000		100,000
Shelbyville Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown)	695,000		695,000	
Sny Island Levee Drainage District		166,000		166,000
Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	1,000,000		1,000,000	
The Sny Basin	3,500,000		3,500,000	
Indiana:				
Brookville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	9,871,000		9,871,000	
Evansville	800,000		800,000	
Huntington Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
Levee unit 5, Wabash River	825,000		825,000	
Mason J. Niblack levee	650,000		650,000	

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Indiana—Continued				
McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)				
Mississinewa Reservoir	$5,100,000		$5,100,000	
Monroe Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		$250,000		$250,000
Salamonie Reservoir	3,520,000		3,520,000	
Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000
Iowa:				
Coralville Reservoir-Mehaffey Bridge			150,000	
Dubuque				35,000
Floyd River and tributaries	3,800,000		3,722,000	
Indian Creek Dam		45,000		45,000
Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Little Sioux River	1,148,000		1,148,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	5,600,000		5,600,000	
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
(*a*) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(*b*) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,700,000		2,700,000	
(*c*) Kansas City to the mouth (including 9-foot channel)	2,700,000		2,700,000	
Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	200,000		200,000	

Rathbun Reservoir			400,000	
Red Rock Reservoir	11,200,000		11,200,000	
Saylorville Reservoir			400,000	
Kansas:				
Atchison		100,000		100,000
Clinton Reservoir		60,000		60,000
Council Grove Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Dodge City		185,000		185,000
Elk City Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000	
John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	580,000		580,000	
Marion Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Melvern Reservoir		250,000		250,000
Milford Reservoir	14,925,000		14,925,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Osawatomie		39,000		39,000
Perry Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Pomona Reservoir	1,887,000		1,887,000	
Topeka	3,500,000		3,500,000	
Wilson Reservoir	6,600,000		6,600,000	
Kentucky:				
Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	27,000,000		27,000,000	
Barren River Reservoir	7,067,000		7,067,000	
Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,200,000		9,200,000	
Carr Fork Reservoir		150,000		150,000

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Kentucky—Continued				
Cave Run Reservoir		$220,000		$220,000
Corbin	$270,000		$270,000	
Cumberland		40,000		40,000
Fishtrap Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000	
Grayson Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Green River Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville) Indiana and Kentucky	4,220,000		4,220,000	
Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
Red River Reservoir		50,000		50,000
Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
Louisiana:				
Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway	800,000		800,000	
Calcasieu River and Pass	4,200,000		4,200,000	
Calcasieu River, salt-water barrier		103,000		103,000
Campti Clarence levee		23,000		23,000
Fresh-water Bayou	800,000		800,000	
Mississippi River, gulf outlet	9,000,000		9,000,000	

New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	100,000		100,000	
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
Maine:				
Narraguagus River			500,000	
Portland Harbor, 40-foot channel	[1] 2,000,000		1,000,000	
Searsport Harbor (1962 act)	718,000		718,000	
Maryland:				
Baltimore Harbor and Channel	4,500,000		4,500,000	
Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va		100,000		100,000
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal) part II. (See Delaware.)				
Massachusetts:				
Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	400,000		400,000	
Chelsea River, Boston Harbor				40,000
Chicopee Falls	1,385,000		1,385,000	
Conant Brook Reservoir	350,000		350,000	
Gloucester Harbor			500,000	
Littleville Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	3,634,000		3,634,000	
Plymouth Harbor				35,000
Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000	
Three Rivers	500,000		500,000	
Wareham-Marion		100,000		100,000
Westfield		100,000		100,000

[1] 45-foot channel.

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Michigan:				
Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)		$30,000		$30,000
Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	$1,485,000		$1,485,000	
Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000		800,000	
Ludington Harbor (north revetment)	150,000		150,000	
Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	300,000		300,000	
Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.)				
Muskegon Harbor		18,000	100,000	
Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)		30,000		30,000
Rouge River		200,000		200,000
St. Marys River: New Poe lock	242,000		242,000	
Saginaw River (flood control)	600,000		600,000	
Minnesota:				
Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:				
(*a*) Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(*b*) Outer harbor, 32-foot to 27-foot channels	1,162,000		1,162,000	
Marshall, Redwood River	696,000		696,000	
Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)	200,000		200,000	
St. Paul and South St. Paul	500,000		500,000	
Winona	200,000		200,000	

Mississippi:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Jackson and East Jackson	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Okatibbee Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Pascagoula Harbor	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Missouri:				
Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.)				
Canton	300,000		300,000	
Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only	600,000		600,000	
Chariton River			400,000	
Gregory Drainage District		50,000		50,000
Hannibal		150,000		150,000
Joanna Reservoir		300,000		350,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)				
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		650,000		650,000
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	330,000		330,000	
South River Drainage District	500,000		500,000	
St. Louis	8,000,000		8,000,000	
Stockton Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
Montana:				
Libby Reservoir		1,000,000		1,000,000

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Nebraska:				
Gering Valley	$650,000		$650,000	
Little Papillion Creek		$80,000		$80,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
Norfolk		45,000		45,000
Salt Creek and tributaries	4,200,000		4,200,000	
New Hampshire:				
Portsmouth Harbor			1,000,000	
New Jersey:				
Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)	400,000		400,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages) Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Manasquan River (bulkheads)	350,000		350,000	
New York and New Jersey channels (Shooters Island dike) New York and New Jersey	300,000		300,000	
Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	690,000		690,000	
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J		250,000		250,000
New Mexico:				
Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act)		130,000		130,000
Cochiti Reservoir		308,000		308,000
Galisteo Reservoir		220,000		220,000

Las Cruces		50,000		50,000
Socorro	1,235,000		1,235,000	
New York:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
Buffalo Harbor: South Entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels	707,000		707,000	
Buffalo Harbor (27-foot, outer harbor)			250,000	
Buttermilk Channel	700,000		700,000	
Cayuga Inlet, Ithaca			300,000	
Fire Island Inlet, Long Island	500,000		500,000	
Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	2,100,000		2,100,000	
Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act)	917,000		917,000	
Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	380,000		380,000	
Herkimer	286,000		286,000	
Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,100,000		5,100,000	
Lackawanna	300,000		300,000	
Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River		100,000		100,000
Little Sodus Bay (piers)		20,000		20,000
New York and New Jersey channels (Shooters Island dikes), New York and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)				
Oswego Harbor				60,000
Rochester Harbor	1,025,000		1,025,000	
Rosendale				100,000
Salamanca				20,000
South Amsterdam	700,000		700,000	
North Carolina:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection		80,000		80,000
Swift Creek			250,000	

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
North Dakota:				
Garrison Reservoir	$700,000		$700,000	
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
Ohio:				
Ashtabula Harbor 27–30-foot channels, deepen turning area	383,000		383,000	
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	7,000,000		7,000,000	
Big Darby Creek Reservoir		$266,000		$266,000
Buck Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
Caesar Creek Reservoir				75,000
Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
Cleveland Harbor: Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	900,000		900,000	
Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters)	300,000		300,000	
Conneaut Harbor (1962 act)			225,000	
Deer Creek Reservoir		216,000		216,000
East Fork Reservoir				75,000
Fremont		100,000		100,000
Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		250,000		250,000
Lorain Harbor	4,100,000		4,100,000	
Manchester (restudy)				8,000
North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir		75,000		75,000
Paint Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000

Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,000,000	----------	9,000,000	----------
Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------
Salt Creek Reservoir	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
Sandusky Harbor	1,531,000	----------	1,531,000	----------
Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	370,000	----------	370,000	----------
Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
Toledo Harbor	6,268,000	----------	6,268,000	----------
West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	3,700,000	----------	3,700,000	----------
Youngstown, Crab Creek	----------	50,000	----------	50,000
Oklahoma:				
Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
Birch Reservoir	----------	125,000	----------	125,000
Broken Bow Reservoir	3,900,000	----------	3,900,000	----------
Copan Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	100,000
Eufaula Reservoir	18,500,000	----------	18,500,000	----------
Kaw Reservoir	----------	200,000	----------	200,000
Keystone Reservoir	15,500,000	----------	15,500,000	----------
Optima Reservoir	----------	200,000	----------	200,000
Pine Creek Reservoir	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------
Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------
Skiatook Reservoir	----------	40,000	----------	40,000
Webbers Falls lock and dam	----------	370,000	----------	370,000
Oregon:				
Blue River Reservoir	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40- foot projects, Oregon and Washington	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington	----------	170,000	----------	170,000

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Oregon—Continued				
Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty) Oregon and Washington	$500,000		$500,000	
Cougar Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000	
Fall Creek Reservoir	3,740,000		3,740,000	
Green Peter Reservoir	11,650,000		11,650,000	
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	57,000,000		57,000,000	
Lost Creek Reservoir		$100,000		$100,000
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
Tillamook Bay and Harbor	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000	
Yaquina Bay and Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Pennsylvania:				
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y	21,227,000		21,227,000	
Beltzville Reservoir		240,000		240,000
Bethlehem	370,000		370,000	
Blanchard Reservoir		428,000		428,000
Butler	750,000		750,000	
Curwensville Reservoir	6,800,000		6,800,000	
Dam 4, Monongahela River	2,300,000		2,300,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
Elkland	250,000		250,000	

Latrobe	----------	117,000	----------	117,000
Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	5,000,000	----------	5,000,000	----------
Raystown Reservoir	----------	----------	----------	150,000
Scranton	----------	100,000	----------	100,000
Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa	10,800,000	----------	10,800,000	----------
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)				
Turtle Creek	3,200,000	----------	3,200,000	----------
Union City Reservoir	----------	150,000	----------	150,000
Puerto Rico:				
San Juan Harbor	4,633,000	----------	4,633,000	----------
Rhode Island:				
Fox Point Barrier	3,000,000	----------	3,000,000	----------
Lower Woonsocket	1,450,000	----------	1,450,000	----------
Narragansett Pier hurricane barrier	----------	----------	----------	50,000
Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters)	470,000	----------	470,000	----------
Point Judith hurricane barrier	----------	----------	----------	50,000
South Carolina:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
South Dakota:				
Big Bend Reservoir	23,800,000	----------	23,800,000	----------
Fort Randall Reservoir	2,700,000	----------	2,700,000	----------
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	5,700,000	----------	5,700,000	----------
Tennessee:				
Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
Cordell Hull Dam	2,400,000	----------	4,800,000	----------
J. Percy Priest Reservoir	3,700,000	----------	4,800,000	----------
Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
Texas:				
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
Bardwell Reservoir	3,700,000	----------	3,700,000	----------

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Texas—Continued				
Big Fossil Creek	$500,000		$500,000	
Brazos Island Harbor (Bend Elimination at Brownsville Turning Basin only) (1960 Act)	800,000		800,000	
Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	500,000		500,000	
Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,900,000		3,900,000	
Canyon Reservoir	3,682,000		3,682,000	
Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension		$132,000		$132,000
Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	500,000		500,000	
Freeport and vicinity		60,000		60,000
Galveston Harbor (jetties)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Palacios				30,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes	562,000		562,000	
Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	3,800,000		3,800,000	
Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		150,000		150,000
Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	7,000,000		7,000,000	
Pat Mayse Reservoir		100,000		100,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	750,000		750,000	
Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)		300,000		300,000

Proctor Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)				
Sabine-Neches Waterway:				
(a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo		300,000		300,000
(b) Rectification and widening (1954 act)	2,138,000		2,138,000	
Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	12,450,000		12,450,000	
San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Somerville Reservoir	8,100,000		8,100,000	
Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,400,000		3,400,000	
Texas City	3,000,000		3,000,000	
Texas City channel (dikes)	835,000		835,000	
Vince and Little Vince Bayous		80,000		80,000
Waco Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000	
Wallisville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
Vermont:				
Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	555,000		555,000	
Virginia:				
Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.)	620,000		620,000	
John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Norfolk	250,000		250,000	
North Fork of Pound Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000	
Washington:				
Colfax	600,000		600,000	
Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Washington—Continued				
Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		$39,000		$39,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Little Goose lock and dam	$11,000,000		$11,000,000	
Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
Lower Granite lock and dam		884,000		884,000
Lower Monumental lock and dam	23,000,000		23,000,000	
Port Townsend	598,000		598,000	
Pullman		80,000		80,000
Sammamish River	729,000		729,000	
Swinomish Channel			150,000	
Washougal flood control			100,000	
West Virginia:				
Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Buckhannon		73,000		73,000
East Lynn Reservoir		280,000		280,000
Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Justice Reservoir		300,000		150,000
Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				

Opekiska lock and dam	5,058,000		5,058,000	
Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
Summersville Reservoir	10,900,000		10,900,000	
Wisconsin:				
Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)				
Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	200,000		200,000	
Kenosha Harbor			200,000	
Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)		30,000		30,000
Kickapoo River				50,000
Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis	400,000		400,000	
Milwaukee Harbor		40,000		40,000
Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	600,000		600,000	
Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier)	188,000		188,000	
Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal	400,000		400,000	
Wyoming:				
Jackson Hole	479,000		479,000	
Miscellaneous:				
Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	
Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000	50,000		50,000	
Projects referred for restudy		150,000		150,000
Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Small authorized projects	2,128,000		2,128,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000	

Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Miscellaneous—Continued				
Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	$2,300,000		$2,300,000	
Employees compensation	72,000		72,000	
General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities			—6,033,300	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	—65,000,000		—84,672,000	
Grand total, construction, general	800,471,000	$18,845,000	778,407,700	$19,875,000
	(819,316,000)		(798,282,700)	

REDUCTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

Walter F. George Lock and Dam, Alabama-Georgia.—The budget proposed an appropriations of $500,000 for the purchase of 2,311 acres of land for wildlife refuge purposes. It is the Committee's opinion that if further acquisition of lands are justified for wildlife refuge purposes they should be funded through the regular wetlands acquisition program.

Oroville Reservoir, California.—A reduction of $3,445,000 in the budget estimate of $8,000,000 is recommended. The amount provided is $4,555,000, and is estimated by the Corps of Engineers to be sufficient to cover earnings during fiscal year 1963 on construction of the flood control features, which are being reimbursed to the state by the Federal Government. It also includes interest on this phase of the construction costs at the rate of 2⅞ percent, the going rate of interest on long-term borrowings by the Federal Government. This action is comparable to that taken by the Committee last year. As pointed out in the report at that time, the policy has now been established that the Federal Government will use only the going Federal rate of interest on partnership projects such as this one, wherein the flood control storage is being paid for by the Federal Government. On this particular project an original agreement between the Federal Government and the State was that the Government would pay for the flood control storage plus interest at the rate of 3½ percent which represented a compromise on the cost of money to the State and the Federal going rate of interest. By reimbursing the State at the going rate of interest to the Federal Government, approximately $4.6 million will be saved during the construction of the project. The Committee intends to assure that this saving is realized.

Sacramento River projects, California.—The Committee received testimony that Glenn and Butte Counties have refused to undertake flood plain zoning in connection with the Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff project. Such flood plain zoning is considered necessary to preclude, to the extent feasible, the construction of improvements in the flood plain in order to prevent a future flood damage problem. Because of this failure to provide flood plain zoning, the budget estimate included no funds for construction in these counties on the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project. The budget proposal did, however, include funds for construction work in these two counties on the Sacramento River Flood control project and on the Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries project. The Committee sees no reason why the portions of these two projects in Glenn and Butte Counties should proceed until the required flood plain zoning on the Chico Landing to Red Bluff project has been instituted. Consequently it has reduced the Sacramento River Flood control project from $900,000 to $840,000, a reduction of $60,000 which was planned for work in the two counties involved. On the Sacramento River major and minor tributaries project, the budget estimate was $1,500,000 of which $1,430,000 was programmed for construction work in the two counties. This latter amount has been deleted leaving a balance of $70,000 for this project.

Central and Southern Florida project.—The amount provided on this project includes up to $200,000 for the beginning of construction on Canal C–111 and up to $300,000 for beginning construction on the Cutler Drain.

Mount Carmel, Illinois.—The Committee has stated in its reports on the bills of the last two years that it intended to enforce a policy of 20 percent contribution on local protection projects before beginning construction. The local contribution being required on the Mount Carmel, Illinois, project is less than 20 percent, and the project is budgeted as a new construction start. Under the policy stated, the Committee would normally have denied funds to begin this project. However, construction is already underway on Levee Unit 5 directly opposite Mount Carmel on the Indiana side of the river. The Committee received testimony to the effect that the construction of this levee would aggravate the flooding problem on the Illinois side of the river if the Mount Carmel project were not constructed. Under the circumstances the Committee has allowed the $300,000 budgeted for Mount Carmel. This action is not to be interpreted as an abandonment of the 20 percent policy or as a precedent in future cases where the 20 percent requirement is appropriate.

Floyd River, Iowa.—The budget estimate of $3,800,000 for construction on this project has been reduced to $3,722,000, a reduction of $78,000. This reduction represents 10 percent of the cost of Highway 29 bridges, crossing the river project. In the original authorization these bridges were to be provided by local interests. The authorization was subsequently amended to provide for Federal construction of the bridges involved. Since they are part of the Federal-aid highway program, the Committee feels that it is appropriate that the State should fund at least 10 percent of their cost which conforms to the Federal-aid highway program formula. The reduction of $78,000 is 10 percent of the amount programmed in fiscal year 1964 for construction of these bridges.

Rathbun and Saylorville Reservoirs, Iowa.—With reference to both the construction and the operation of these reservoirs, the Committee directs that there be no infringement on the flood control storage capacity for the purposes of fish and wildlife and recreation.

The Committee has been advised that the construction of the Saylorville Reservoir will require the abandonment of the water supply facilities for the Woodward State Hospital School at Woodward, Iowa. The United States will contribute toward the cost of development of a new source for water supply, such contribution to be limited to the estimated cost of relocating the existing water supply facilities. A critical water supply situation presently exists which would require improvement of the existing well field. Rather than increase the value of service to be replaced the Committee directs that the State be advised to proceed with the relocating of the facilities. Funds provided for the project may be used to reimburse the State for costs in this connection.

Portland Harbor, Maine.—The budget proposal on this project is $2,000,000 for construction of the authorized 45-foot channel. The Committee has recommended $1,000,000 for construction of a 40-foot channel. The Committee is not satisfied that the benefits associated with the added cost of a 45-foot channel justify Federal expenditure for this depth. In addition, the precedent implications in providing

such a depth particularly when it is justified principally on a one-commodity basis is of concern to the Committee.

Chariton River, Missouri.—The Committee is advised that a group of generating and transmission cooperatives in Missouri have been granted an REA loan for the construction of a steam electric generating plant which may be located at Thomas Hill, Missouri. This plant would depend upon a water supply from the Thomas Hill Reservoir, an element in the Chariton River project development plan. Funds have been provided for beginning construction of the Chariton River project, including the Little Chariton River, so that arrangements for industrial water supply may be firmed up at the earliest possible date.

Missouri River, Kansas City to the Mouth.—The amount provided for this project, $2,700,000, includes funds for proceeding with the construction of the 9-foot navigation channel. It is the Committee's desire that completion of the 9-foot channel be expedited.

Justice Reservoir, West Virginia.—The Committee has allowed $150,000 of the requested $300,000 for advance planning on the Justice Reservoir project. Within this amount such funds as may be necessary shall be used for a reevaluation of an alternate flood control plan limited to realignment and improvement of the river channel, with such minor retention structures as may be appropriate in connection with such a project. It is expected that a further public hearing will be held on the alternate project proposals and that a report will be submitted to the Committee.

Small Authorized Projects, Sandy Slough, Missouri.—Construction work on Sandy Slough, Missouri, is not to be started until the feasibility of extending the project to the Kings Lake pumping station has been determined.

Recreation Facilities.—A total of $16,033,300 is budgeted for recreation facilities on the various projects in the bill, including $4,000,000 for such facilities on completed projects. The Committee has reduced this total to $10,000,000, including $150,000 for Berlin Reservoir, Ohio. The reduction is principally an offset to the amounts received by the Corps for recreation facilities through the accelerated public works program. These allocations totalled approximately $5,500,000.

Reduction to offset unobligated balances and slippages.—The Committee has further reduced the overall budget request for the Construction, General Program by $19,672,000. The budget estimate of unobligated balances to be carried into fiscal year 1964 was $6,500,000. This balance was actually $40,924,200. The additional reduction which the Committee is proposing is easily offset by this carryover and it should not retard the progress of the overall program, particularly in view of the fact that about 6 months of the working year will have elapsed before the fiscal year 1964 funds for new projects become available. Included in this reduction are the funds budgeted for 180 new positions.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1963	$145, 850, 350
Estimate, 1964	157, 368, 000
Recommended, 1964	150, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+4, 149, 650
Estimate, 1964	−7, 368, 000

The Committee recognizes the desirability of maintaining adequately the completed facilities of the Corps in order to avoid excessive and unnecessary major repairs. However, in view of the large rehabilitation program which has been funded in the last several years and the fact that the increases requested in this program will be available for only about 6 months of the fiscal year, the Committee believes that the reduction can be absorbed without detriment to the general maintenance program.

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$14, 165, 200
Estimate, 1964	15, 252, 000
Recommended, 1964	15, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+834, 800
Estimate, 1964	−252, 000

In making the reduction in this item, the Committee has disallowed funds for 15 new budgeted positions and 10 percent of the pay act cost increases which amounts to approximately $50,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Appropriation, 1963	$73, 504, 000
Estimate, 1964	74, 860, 000
Recommended, 1964	74, 500, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+996, 000
Estimate, 1964	−360, 000

The funds appropriated under this heading are distributed as shown in the table which follows:

Projects	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:				
(*a*) Examinations and surveys	$25,000		$25,000	
(*b*) Collection and study of basic data	85,000		85,000	
Subtotal, general investigations	110,000		110,000	
2. Construction and planning:				
Mississippi River levees	$2,580,000		$2,580,000	
Channel improvement	26,500,000		26,500,000	
Memphis Harbor	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Old River control	1,225,000		1,225,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower White River	850,000		850,000	
Cache River	50,000			
West Tennessee tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	395,000		395,000	
Lower Arkansas	400,000		400,000	
Tensas Basin, Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Yazoo Basin:				
Sardis Reservoir	58,000		58,000	
Enid Reservoir	56,000		56,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	49,000		49,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Main stem	2,200,000		2,200,000	

Projects	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964		Allocation	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
2. Construction and planning—Continued				
Yazoo Basin—Continued				
Tributaries	$1,000,000	----------	$1,000,000	----------
Big Sunflower River, etc	1,100,000	----------	1,100,000	----------
Yazoo backwater	1,700,000	----------	1,700,000	----------
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries	50,000	----------	50,000	----------
Atchafalaya Basin	7,000,000	----------	7,000,000	----------
Subtotal, construction and planning	54,250,000	----------	54,200,000	----------
Reduction for anticipated svaings and slippages	—1,500,000	----------	—1,810,000	----------
Total, construction and planning	52,750,000	----------	52,390,000	----------
3. Maintenance	22,000,000	----------	22,000,000	----------
Grand total	$74,860,000		$74,500,000	

REDUCTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

The reduction which the Committee has made includes funds for five new positions requested and the $50,000 budgeted for the Cache River project, Arkansas. The latter amount was for an advancement to the State Highway Department for added costs of Highway Number 64 bridges across the project in order to meet the project dimensions should it be built. If built, the project would be of general benefit to the State and the Committee sees no reason why the State should not stand this added cost, if it wants the project.

Lower Mississippi operations.—The operations of the Corps of Engineers at Greenwood, Greenville, and Natchez in Mississippi, have been very effective and efficient for years, and no action shall be taken to remove operations which have been carried on from these locations.

Yazoo Basin project, Mississippi.—The counties which suffered road damages by reason of building the Sardis Reservoir executed a full release for such damages at the time. It appears to the Committee that the amount paid is unreasonably small, as compared to the value of the Teckville crossing to adjacent counties. It is the opinion of the Committee that if the state should provide a first rate or primary through highway by way of the former Teckville Crossing, the Corps of Engineers should reopen the matter of prior settlement as authorized by Public Law 526, 79th Congress, and make additional contributions above the usual 50 percent for constructing a crossing in line with the value of the crossing destroyed.

The Committee directs the Corps to keep open the streams which run into the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, and that Federal lands in such areas under the control of the Corps shall be handled in such a matter as to enable lessors to operate in such a way as to maintain and develop such lands.

PANAMA CANAL

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$23,405,650
Estimate, 1964	26,465,000
Recommended, 1964	25,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+1,594,350
Estimate, 1964	−1,465,000

The reduction made by the Committee includes $52,000 for additional positions requested for activities other than education, hospitals and other public services. It also includes a reduction of $124,000 which is approximately 20 percent of the pay act cost increases. It is believed that the remaining portion of the reduction can be readily absorbed since the increase over fiscal year 1963 funding level will be available for only about a six-month period.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Appropriation, 1963	$3, 120, 000
Estimate, 1964	7, 250, 000
Recommended, 1964	6, 500, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+3, 380, 000
Estimate, 1964	−750, 000

The reduction made by the Committee is based on anticipated slippages and delays in the construction program due to the fact that the increase provided over fiscal year 1963 will be available for only about a six-month period.

Panama Canal Company

LIMITATION ON GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The Committee has made a reduction of $550,000 in the limitation on General Administrative Expenses for the Panama Canal Company. This reduction includes 20 percent of the increased costs for the pay act, and $183,000 for expansion of the personnel administration programs. It is believed that the remaining portion of the decrease can be absorbed since the higher level of funding will be available for only about a six-month period.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1963	$8, 632, 750
Estimate, 1964	11, 361, 000
Recommended, 1964	9, 894, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+1, 261, 250
Estimate, 1964	−1, 467, 000

The reduction below the budget estimate includes approximately 25 percent of the cost of the pay act increases, and a reduction of $550,000 in funds programmed for comprehensive basin surveys. This latter reduction represents half of the budget increase for these studies, which is made on the same basis as the reduction in the general investigations program in the Corps of Engineers; that is insufficient coordination between agencies and planning deficiencies in outlining this new program. As in the case of the Corps, the Committee does not expect this program to be used as an excuse for adding additional personnel but believes that it can be handled adequately through realignment of responsibilities of existing personnel. The remaining portion of the reduction is based on carry-over from fiscal year 1963 to 1964 in this activity and anticipated slippage.

The authority for transfer of funds between investigations without Committee approval is increased from 15 percent to 25 percent of the amount budgeted for the item being increased.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Appropriation, 1963	$163, 518, 000
Estimate, 1964	195, 760, 000
Recommended, 1964	180, 190, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+16, 672, 000
Estimate, 1964	−15, 570, 000

The projects and activities funded under this heading are shown in the following table:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Allocation	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
Arizona:				
Colorado River front work and levee system	$4,350,000		$4,550,000	
Gila project	2,855,000		2,855,000	
Parker-Davis project	973,000		973,000	
California:				
Central Valley project	50,445,000		48,295,000	
Colorado River front work and levee system. (See Arizona.)				
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, initial phase. (See Nevada.)				
Colorado:				
Denver office computer	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Trinidad project		$7,000		$7,000
Idaho: Mann Creek project		150,000		150,000
Kanas: Wichita project, Cheney division	3,800,000		3,800,000	
Nevada:				
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, initial phase		110,000		110,000
New Mexico:				
Rio Grande project, recreational facilities	460,000		300,000	

Oklahoma:				
Arbuckle project	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Norman project	7,400,000		7,400,000	
Oregon:				
Baker project, upper division		200,000		200,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir	300,000		300,000	
The Dalles project, Western division	3,150,000		3,150,000	
Vale project, Bully Creek extension	642,000		642,000	
Texas:				
Canadian River project	23,000,000		23,000,000	
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, La Feria division	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, Mercedes division	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Utah:				
Weber Basin project	11,309,000		11,309,000	
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division	1,325,000		1,325,000	
Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket unit		225,000		225,000
Columbia Basin project	3,900,000		3,900,000	
Spokane Valley project	600,000		600,000	
Various:				
Drainage and minor construction program	2,432,000		2,432,000	
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,943,000		3,943,000	
Subtotal, exclusive of Missouri River Basin project	128,484,000	692,000	126,374,000	692,000

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Allocation	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT				
Colorado:				
Narrows unit, South Platte division	----------	$139,000	----------	$139,000
North Republican unit. (See Nebraska.)				
Kansas:				
Almena unit	$5,580,000	----------	$3,983,000	----------
Glen Elder unit	5,000,000	----------	5,000,000	----------
Kanopolis unit, Smoky Hill division	----------	10,000	----------	----------
Wilson unit, Smoky Hill division	----------	129,000	----------	129,000
Montana:				
Chestnut Valley unit, Helena-Great Falls division	----------	3,000	----------	3,000
Cracker Box, Marsh, and Stipek units, Yellowstone division	----------	54,000	----------	54,000
East Bench unit	4,400,000	----------	4,400,000	----------
Jefferson and Whitehall units, Three Forks division	----------	97,700	----------	97,700
West Bench unit, Three Forks division	----------	27,000	----------	27,000
Yellowtail unit	19,000,000	----------	19,000,000	----------
Nebraska:				
Ainsworth unit	8,100,000	----------	8,100,000	----------
Cedar Rapids division	----------	195,000	----------	195,000
Farwell unit	5,000,000	----------	5,000,000	----------
Frenchman Cambridge division	1,787,000	----------	1,787,000	----------
North Republican unit, upper Republican division	----------	84,000	----------	84,000

North Dakota:				
Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division		54,000		54,000
South Dakota:				
Crazy Horse, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, South Dakota pumping division		5,300		5,300
Garrison diversion unit. (See North Dakota.)				
Joe Creek, Culdesac, and Rousseau units, South Dakota pumping division		92,000		92,000
Oahe unit, James division		253,000		186,500
Oahe unit, James section	365,000		365,000	
Wyoming:				
Kaycee unit, Powder division		200,000		133,500
Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.)				
Various:				
Transmission division	23,956,000		23,000,000	
Drainage and minor construction program	2,258,000		2,258,000	
Subtotal, construction and advance planning (MRB)	75,446,000	1,343,000	72,893,000	1,200,000
Investigations	', 824,000		1,557,000	
Other Department agencies	3,322,300		3,180,000	
Total, Missouri River Basin project	80,592,300	1,343,000	77,630,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	211,111,300		205,896,000	
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−15,351,300		−25,706,000	
Total, construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000		180,190,000	

REDUCTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona–California.—The increase of $200,000 which the Committee is recommending in this item is for additional wells for ground water recovery on the Yuma Valley project.

Central Valley Project, California.—Of the reduction made in the budget estimate for this project $150,000 is for a proposed boat ramp to move small pleasure boats from below the Red Bluff Diversion Dam to the lake above the dam. The Committee knows of no instance where such a facility has been put in place on any reservoir project and it does not intend to set a precedent which could run into very costly construction programs in the future.

In addition, the Committee has disallowed $2,000,000 of the $4,000,000 programmed for engineering and construction in connection with extra-high voltage transmission lines for interconnecting the Bonneville power system and power systems in California and the Southwest. The use of these funds is subject to the same restrictions that the committee has placed on the use of intertie funds being appropriated to the Bonneville Power Administration.

Rio Grande Project, New Mexico—Recreation Facilities.—A reduction of $160,000 in the budget estimate of $460,000 has been made on this project. The Committee does not expect to provide additional funds for recreation facilities at the two reservoirs involved until the State of New Mexico agrees to contribute to the cost of such facilities or, at a minimum, to contract to operate and maintain such facilities once constructed.

Missouri River Basin Project, Almena Unit, Kansas.—A reduction of $1,597,000 has been made in the budget estimate of $5,580,000. This action deletes the funds programmed for irrigation features on the project. While construction funds were provided for beginning construction of these features in the fiscal year 1963 appropriation bill, none have been obligated as yet because of the high investment per acre required under the original construction plan. The Committee directs that further consideration be given to reducing the assigned cost to irrigation and to thus improve the overall repayment picture.

Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas.—None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

Missouri River Basin, Transmission Division.—The Committee recommends $23,000,000, a reduction of $956,000 in the budget estimate of $23,956,000. Included in the reduction is $305,000 for the budgeted Lusk-Osage line in South Dakota, since a satisfactory wheeling arrangement is anticipated with the Black Hill Power Company, to move Federal power. The remainder of the reduction should be readily absorbed in view of the fact that funds appropriated for new construction will be available for only about a six-month period.

Missouri Basin, General Investigations.—The Committee recommends a reduction of $267,000 in the budget estimate of $1,824,000. This reduction includes $67,000 offered by the Bureau on the Mirage Flats Nebraska Unit. The remainder of the reduction should be

readily absorbed. It represents half of the increase requested and is based on a six month fund availability. Within the amount allowed $50,000 is for the Pollock-Herreid Irrigation Unit, Campbell County, South Dakota.

Missouri River Basin Project, Advance Planning.—The reduction of $143,000, recommended by the Committee includes $10,000 for the Kanapolis Unit in Kansas. The remainder of the reduction is to be absorbed one half each on the Oahe, South Dakota and the Kaycee, Wyoming projects, for which large increases were requested. The Committee is confident that on a probable six-month fund availability basis these reductions can be absorbed without detriment to the rate of progress on these two studies.

Missouri River Basin project, transfers to other agencies.—The nominal reduction of $142,300 in this item is associated with the lower level of the general investigations program being recommended by the Committee.

Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays and slippages.—The Committee has increased the budget estimate for anticipated delays and slippages from $15,351,300 to $25,706,000. The increase in this reduction for slippage is offset by the carryover of approximately $10,000,000 from fiscal year 1963 into fiscal year 1964, which was not anticipated at the time of the budget preparation. The increased slippage figure includes $500,000 for 87 new positions which are not required because of more effective manpower utilization.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$35, 845, 530
Estimate, 1964	38, 588, 000
Recommended, 1964	38, 000, 000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+2, 154, 470
Estimate, 1964	−588, 000

The reduction applied by the Committee includes $150,000 budgeted for new positions. The remaining portion of the cut should be readily absorbed since the increased level of expenditure is applicable for only about a six-month period.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1963	$12, 217, 000
Estimate, 1964	13, 300, 000
Recommended, 1964	12, 217, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	----------
Estimate, 1964	−1, 083, 000

The funds provided are distributed as shown in the following table:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)	Allocation
Arizona:		
Roosevelt Irrigation District	$1,962,000	$1,962,000
California:		
Arvin-Edison Water Storage District	3,342,000	3,342,000
Banta-Carbona Irrigation District	261,000	261,000
Eastern Municipal Water District	1,300,000	1,300,000
Feather Water District	1,685,000	1,685,000
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District	204,839	204,839
Jackson Valley Irrigation District	23,800	23,800
South San Joaquin Irrigation District	975,000	975,000
Hawaii:		
Molokai project	1,282,100	1,282,100
Idaho:		
Cassia Creek Reservoir Co	1,383,000	383,000
Utah:		
Settlement Canyon Irrigation District	817,000	817,000
Administration of loan program	124,409	124,409
Prior year funds available	—60,148	—60,148
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays and savings		—83,000
Total, loan program	13,300,000	12,217,000

Included in the reduction recommended by the Committee is $1,000,000 which was programmed for the Cassia Creek Reservoir, Idaho. This reduction was offered by the Bureau in view of the fact that complicated water rights problems which must be adjudicated have delayed construction of the project. The additional $83,000 reduction brings the recommended appropriation back to the fiscal year 1963 level. It is believed that this minor additional reduction will be absorbed without detriment to the program.

Upper Colorado River Basin Fund

Appropriation, 1963	$111,808,000
Estimate, 1964	101,287,000
Recommended, 1964	97,845,700
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	—13,962,300
Estimate, 1964	—3,441,300

The projects and activities funded under this heading are distributed as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Allocation	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT				
Arizona:				
Glen Canyon unit	$25,360,000	----------	$25,360,000	----------
Colorado:				
Curecanti unit	18,822,000	----------	18,822,000	----------
Utah:				
Glen Canyon unit. (See Arizona.)				
Flaming Gorge unit	4,639,381	----------	4,639,381	----------
Wyoming:				
Flaming Gorge unit. (See Utah.)				
Transmission division	37,670,000	----------	36,000,000	----------
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS				
Colorado:				
Florida project	2,255,000	----------	2,255,000	----------
San Juan-Chama project	1,600,000	----------	1,600,000	----------
Silt project	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
New Mexico:				
San Juan-Chama project. (See Colorado.)				
Utah:				
Central Utah project, initial phase	----------	$1,721,300	----------	$1,400,000
Emery County project	3,853,000	----------	3,853,000	----------
Lyman project. (See Wyoming.)				

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Allocation	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS—continued				
Wyoming:				
Lyman project	$600,000		$600,000	
Seedskadee project	6,000,000		6,000,000	
Drainage and minor construction program	64,619		64,619	
Quality of water studies		$73,700		$73,700
Subtotal	101,364,000	1,795,000	99,694,000	1,473,700
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	—6,181,000		—7,131,000	
Total, Upper Colorado River Basin fund	96,978,000		94,036,700	
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES				
National Park Service	3,000,000		2,500,000	
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	1,309,000		1,309,000	
Total, recreational and fish and wildlife	4,309,000		3,809,000	
Total, Upper Colorado River storage project	101,287,000		97,845,700	

REDUCTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

Advance planning.—The Committee recommends a reduction of $321,300 in the budget estimate of $1,795,000. This represents approximately one half of the requested increase above fiscal year 1963 for the Central Utah project and is based on six-month availability of funds.

Transmission Division.—The reduction of $1,670,000 recommended in this program is again based on the six-month availability of funds requested for 1964, and should be absorbed in delays in getting new construction contracts underway.

Seedskadee project, Wyoming.—The Committee has recommended the budget estimate of $6,000,000 for this project and approves the use of $230,000 of the available funds for operation of a development farm.

Recreational and Fish and Wildlife Facilities.—In its report last year the Committee expressed dissatisfaction with the high level of funding for Park Service facilities in connection with this project and directed that a review be undertaken looking toward reduction of the total estimated costs. In response, the Bureau came to the Committee this year with an increase in the cost of the overall program proposed. The reduction of $500,000, which has been made in the budget estimate of $3,000,000 is for the purpose of emphasizing the Committee's expectations that the overall cost of this program will be scaled down. One specific item which the Committee expects to have presented with a lower cost is the administration building at the Wahweap site on the Glen Canyon Reservoir, for which a total cost of $200,000 is currently projected.

Reduction for anticipated delays and slippage.—The Committee has increased the budgeted slippage of $6,181,000 to $7,131,000. The increase of $950,000 eliminates funds for 158 positions which were programmed for this project, not now necessary because of improved manpower utilization.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$9,666,320
Estimate, 1964	10,051,000
Recommended, 1964	10,000,000
Comparison:	
Appropriation, 1963	+333,680
Estimate, 1964	−51,000

The reduction applied to this item equals approximately 15 percent of the increased cost due to the pay act legislation.

The Committee is gratified with actions taken by the Bureau in reducing positions below the 1963 level.

Bonneville Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1963	$29,800,000
Estimate, 1964	56,058,000
Recommended, 1964	36,000,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+6,200,000
Estimate, 1964	−20,058,000

The following items on which the Committee received testimony that delay, other service arrangements, or cancellation would eliminate the need for funds in 1964 have been deleted:

Dorena Service, $250,000.
Noxon-Hot Springs Line, $1,950,000.
Blaine Substation, $275,000.
Pullman Service, $85,000.
Transformers for Julieatta and Orofino, $170,000.

In addition, the Committee has applied the following reductions:

Pacific Coast Intertie, $16,500,000.
Preliminary Engineering (other than $1,500,000 programmed for the interconnections to the Pacific Southwest), $500,000.
Elimination of 60 of the 118 new positions requested, $328,000.

The Committee has allowed $5,000,000, to be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior, to begin construction of two extra-high voltage transmission lines between the Bonneville Power Administration's system on the Columbia River and power systems in California and the Southwest, at least one of which shall connect with the California Power Pool system at the northern California border and be terminated at that point. The Committee directs that construction of the lines not begin unless Congress has enacted S–1007 or similar legislation defining the primary marketing area of the Bonneville Power Administration. In addition construction shall not begin unless the Secretary of the Interior finds, after good-faith negotiations with utilities and other entities interested in constructing any portion of the lines involved, that their proposals will not result in benefits to the Federal Government equal to those to be derived from Federal construction.

This action is taken with full recognition of the provisions of S–1007 as passed the House. It is not intended to prejudge this prospective legislation but only to provide for the beginning of construction, when and if appropriate, in order to achieve the benefits to all parties concerned at the earliest practical date.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$13, 126, 250
Estimate, 1964	13, 929, 000
Recommended, 1964	13, 200, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+73, 750
Estimate, 1964	−729, 000

The reduction applied by the Committee includes funds budgeted for 30 of the 51 new positions requested, and 20 percent of the pay act cost increases. These two items total approximately $285,000. The remaining portions of the reduction should be readily absorbed.

Revenues from Bonneville Power Administration operations are estimated at $86,900,000 in fiscal year 1964.

Southeastern Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$800,000
Estimate, 1964	1,000,000
Recommended, 1964	1,000,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+200,000
Estimate, 1964	----------

The principal portion of the increase over the 1963 appropriation is $114,000 for purchase of power, the estimate for which is based on the worst water year of record. The other minor increases appear to be well justified.

Revenues of the Southeastern Power Administration are estimated at $23,500,000 in fiscal year 1964.

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1963	$7,210,000
Estimate, 1964	3,520,000
Recommended, 1964	3,000,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	−4,210,000
Estimate, 1964	−520,000

The reduction applied by the Committee includes funds programmed for six new positions, one half of those budgeted. The remaining portion of the reduction is based on the six-month fund availability and should be easily absorbed in the new construction items programmed.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$1,479,450
Estimate, 1964	1,568,000
Recommended, 1964	1,500,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+20,550
Estimate, 1964	−68,000

The minor reduction made by the Committee in this item includes 20 percent of the additional costs of the pay act.

Revenues of the Southwestern Power Administration are estimated at $10,800,000 in fiscal year 1964.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$2,872,224,000
Estimate, 1964	2,423,500,000
Recommended, 1964	2,308,169,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	−564,055,000
Estimate, 1964	−115,331,000

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as shown in the following table:

Program	Budget estimate	Amount recommended	Reduction
Raw materials	$324,843,000	$320,000,000	—$4,843,000
Special nuclear materials	480,471,000	475,000,000	—5,471,000
Weapons	782,969,000	782,969,000	----------
Reactor development	530,548,000	497,000,000	—33,548,000
Physical research	219,077,000	192,137,000	—26,940,000
Biology and medicine	76,973,000	68,645,000	—8,328,000
Training, education, and information	17,194,000	14,350,000	—2,844,000
Isotopes development program	9,260,000	7,860,000	—1,400,000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	15,100,000	10,000,000	—5,100,000
Community program	10,081,000	10,081,000	----------
Program direction and administration	73,415,000	71,560,000	—1,855,000
Security investigation program	6,950,000	6,950,000	----------
Cost of work for others	6,240,000	6,240,000	----------
Change in selected resources	53,252,000	28,250,000	—25,002,000
Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources	—32,000,000	—32,000,000	----------
Unobligated balance brought forward	—150,873,000	—150,873,000	----------
Total	2,423,500,000	2,308,169,000	—115,331,000

REDUCTIONS AND OTHER ACTIONS

Raw Materials.—The reduction of $4,843,000 which the Committee recommends in this program is based on recent years' experience which shows considerable underruns in costs as compared with the estimates submitted in the budget presentation. These underruns were $24,000,000 in 1962 and $18,400,000 in 1963. The Committee is confident that it can reasonably anticipate there will be an underrun of at least the amount of the reduction which has been made in the fiscal year 1964 estimate.

Special Nuclear Materials.—The reduction of $5,471,000 in this program is based on the same type of underrun experience as in the previous program. The underruns here have varied from $7,000,000 to $40,000,000 in the last four years.

Reactor Development.—The reduction of $33,548,000 which the Committee has made in this program includes elimination of about half of the increase requested over the 1963 fiscal level. This reduction is based on six month availability of the 1964 appropriation. In addition, $3,000,000 budgeted for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors

has been deleted. It is the Committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

Of the funds available an additional $3.5 million is to be applied to the development work on the "Seed and Blanket," reactor concept.

Physical Research.—In applying the reduction of $26,940,000 to this program, the Committee has specifically eliminated funds requested for the new "Basic Nuclear Engineering" activity and has eliminated increases requested for all other programs except high energy physics. In addition, $3,750,000 of the total reduction is to be applied to the controlled thermonuclear research program. The Committee indicated last year that it expected that the number of concepts in this program would be reduced. Nothing was done about it. It is expected that this reduction will achieve the objective which the Committee adopted in its action on the 1963 appropriation bill.

The Committee's reaction to increases in this program continues to be as expressed in the report on the bill last year, and it reiterates the admonition that there be a tightening up in the process of selecting areas and subjects of research undertakings with greater emphasis on the overall usefulness of the potential results.

Biology and medicine.—The Committee's reaction to this program is somewhat similar to that of the physical research program. The reduction of $8,328,000 will hold this activity at the 1963 funding level.

Training, education and information.—In applying the reduction of $2,844,000 to this program, the Committee specifically deleted $70,000 for the Argonne School and $75,000 for the Puerto Rico Nuclear Center. The total reduction holds this program to approximately the fiscal year 1963 level.

Isotopes development program.—The reduction of $1,400,000 applied to this program represents about one-half of the increase requested and is based on the six-month fund availability.

Civilian applications of nuclear explosives.—The reduction applied to this program holds the appropriation to approximately the 1963 funding level. It is the Committee's understanding that delays in the program can be anticipated as a result of certain provisions of the test ban agreement. Further, it sees no need to speed up this peaceful use program to the level indicated by the budget.

Community Program.—The Committee has eliminated $750,000 programmed for a community building at Los Alamos. It would be glad to consider funding of such a building, but it is convinced that an adequate facility can be provided at a lower cost.

Program direction and administration.—The reduction of $1,855,000 which the Committee has applied to this item includes the elimination of 73 of the 148 new jobs programmed for a total of approximately $730,000; elimination of approximately two-thirds of the travel increase requested, amounting to $200,000; and elimination of approximately one-half of the contractual services increase, amounting to $625,000. The remaining reduction of $300,000 should be readily

absorbed since the higher level of funding will be available for only about six months of the fiscal year.

Change in selected resources.—This reduction of $25,002,000 which the Committee has made in this program includes $13,002,000 which is approximately one-half of the increases proposed for research and development contracts. This reduction is in line with the reduction that the Committee has made in the research programs. The remaining $12,000,000 of the reduction eliminates obligations planned for the research and development and design assistance program in the civilian power reactor program. This reduction comports with the $3,000,000 reduction in costs made by the Committee in the Reactor Development program previously discussed.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1963	$262, 745, 000
Estimate, 1964	426, 145, 000
Recommended, 1964	380, 000, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+117, 255, 000
Estimate, 1964	−46, 145, 000

The reduction applied by the Committee includes $17,945,000 budgeted for plant and capital equipment projects not yet authorized, $250,000 programmed for the Puerto Rico Training Center, and $27,950,000 slippage. This latter figure represents only one-fifth of the remaining increase requested over the fiscal year 1963, and should be easily absorbed since funds will be available only for about a six-month period. It includes $750,000 programmed for a community building at Los Alamos. The Committee would be glad to consider funding of such a building, but it is convinced that an adequate facility can be provided at a lower cost.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Appropriation, 1963	$35, 071, 000
Estimate, 1964	48, 284, 000
Recommended, 1964	46, 000, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+10, 929, 000
Estimate, 1964	−2, 284, 000

Approximately $18,000,000 of the estimate is for new construction and major increases in going construction projects. Since there will only be about six months in which this higher level of funding can be applied, the Committee is confident that a slippage of $2,284,000 will be realized without detriment to the progress of the programs.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$33, 610
Estimate, 1964	39, 000
Recommended, 1964	38, 000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+4, 390
Estimate, 1964	−1, 000

The reduction in this item is based on the six-month availability of funds.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1963	$80,000
Estimate, 1964	117,000
Recommended, 1964	117,000
Comparisons:	
Appropriation, 1963	+37,000
Estimate, 1964	

The Committee has allowed the budget estimate under this heading which represents the Federal share of the cost of operating the Delaware River Commission as provided in the law establishing that Commission.

Public Works Acceleration

The Committee has disallowed the estimate of $45,000,000 for this program.

TITLE IV

General Provisions

Departments, Agencies and Corporations

This section of the bill carries provisions applicable to all appropriation bills for fiscal 1964. They are placed in this bill rather than repeating them in each separate bill and are the same as last year. In addition, it includes language requested in House Document No. 134 relating to the use of foreign currency.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 8, in connection with the Panama Canal Company:

No real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

On page 9, in connection with Limitation on General and Administrative Expenses, Panama Canal Company:

, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services,

On page 17, in connection with Bureau of Reclamation, Administrative Provisions:

The amount of $241,160 shall be available from "Refunds and returns" for transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the amount of credits accumulated as a reserve for depreciation and/or replacement of Siphon Drop powerplant, Yuma project, Arizona-California; this sum to be transferred to the Yuma County Water Users Association only after a contract providing for the custody, use, or expenditure of said money and containing terms satisfactory to the Secretary has been entered into with said association.

On page 31, in connection with General Provisions, Departments, Agencies, and Corporations:

SEC. 408. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1963 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR 1964

PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Appropriation estimate, 1964	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Army civil functions:			
Payments to States, Flood Control Act of 1954, Army	$1, 828, 000	$1, 828, 000	----------
Corps of Engineers—Civil special expense funds	172, 000	172, 000	----------
Total, Department of Army civil functions	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	----------
Bureau of Reclamation:			
Colorado River Dam fund, Boulder Canyon project:			
Payment of interest on advances from the Treasury	3, 100, 000	3, 100, 000	----------
Payments to States of Arizona and Nevada	600, 000	600, 000	----------
Construction of operation and maintenance headquarters and facilities, irrigation projects	3, 000	----------	−$3, 000
Operation, maintenance, and replacement of project works, North Platte project (Gering and Fort Laramie, Goshen and Pathfinder Irrigation Districts)	4, 000	4, 000	----------
Payment to Farmer's Irrigation District (North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming)	8, 000	8, 000	----------
Refunds and returns	100, 000	100, 000	----------
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	3, 815, 000	3, 812, 000	−3, 000
Total, permanent indefinite appropriations	5, 815, 000	5, 812, 000	−3, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1963 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1964

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Recommended in bill, 1964	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1963	Estimates, 1964
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES					
Salaries and expenses	$10, 333, 000	$10, 846, 000	$10, 800, 000	+$467, 000	−$46, 000
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL					
General investigations	18, 100, 000	20, 020, 000	18, 000, 000	−100, 000	−2, 020, 000
Construction, general	792, 870, 500	[1] 819, 316, 000	798, 282, 700	+5, 412, 200	−21, 033, 300
Operation and maintenance, general	145, 850, 350	157, 368, 000	150, 000, 000	+4, 149, 650	−7, 368. 000
General expenses	14, 165, 200	15, 252, 000	15, 000, 000	+834, 800	−252, 000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	73, 504, 000	74, 860, 000	74, 500, 000	+996, 000	−360, 000
U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers	20, 000	----------	----------	−20, 000	----------
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control	1, 044, 510, 050	1, 086, 816, 000	1, 055, 782, 700	+11, 272, 650	−31, 033, 300

THE PANAMA CANAL					
Canal Zone Government:					
Operating expenses	23,405,650	26,465,000	25,000,000	+1,594,350	−1,465,000
Capital outlay	3,120,000	[1a] 7,250,000	6,500,000	+3,380,000	−750,000
Panama Canal Company: *Limitation on general administrative expenses*	*(8,284,000)*	*(9,550,000)*	*(9,000,000)*	*(+716,000)*	*(−550,000)*
Total, the Panama Canal	26,525,650	33,715,000	31,500,000	+4,974,350	−2,215,000
Total, title I	1,081,368,700	1,131,377,000	1,098,082,700	+16,714,000	−33,294,300
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION					
General investigations	[2] 8,632,750	11,361,000	9,894,000	+1,261,250	−1,467,000
Construction and rehabilitation	[3] 163,518,000	195,760,000	180,190,000	+16,672,000	−15,570,000
Operation and maintenance	[4] 35,845,530	38,588,000	38,000,000	+2,154,470	−588,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	*(3,525,000)*	*(4,363,000)*	*(4,363,000)*	*(+838,000)*	----------
Loan program	[3] 12,217,000	[5] 13,300,000	12,217,000	----------	−1,083,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000	----------	----------	−1,000,000	----------
Upper Colorado River Basin fund	[3] 111,808,000	[6] 101,287,000	97,845,700	−13,962,300	−3,441,300
General administrative expenses	[7] 9,666,320	10,051,000	10,000,000	+333,680	−51,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	342,687,600	370,347,000	348,146,700	+5,459,100	−22,200,300

See footnotes at end of table, p. 66.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964—Con.

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Recommended in bill, 1964	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1963	Estimates, 1964
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Construction	$29,800,000	[8] $56,058,000	$36,000,000	+$6,200,000	−$20,058,000
Operation and maintenance	13,126,250	13,929,000	13,200,000	+73,750	−729,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	42,926,250	69,987,000	49,200,000	+6,273,750	−20,787,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance	800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+200,000	
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Construction	7,210,000	3,520,000	3,000,000	−4,210,000	−520,000
Operation and maintenance	1,479,450	1,568,000	1,500,000	+20,550	−68,000
Continuing fund (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	(*5,000,000*)	(*4,500,000*)	(*4,500,000*)	(*−500,000*)	
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	8,689,450	5,088,000	4,500,000	−4,189,450	−588,000
Total, definite appropriations	395,103,300	446,422,000	402,846,700	+7,743,400	−43,575,300
Total, indefinite appropriations	8,525,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	+338,000	
Total, title II	403,628,300	455,285,000	411,709,700	+8,081,400	−43,575,300

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION					
Operating expenses	2, 872, 224, 000	[9] 2, 423, 500, 000	2, 308, 169, 000	−564, 055, 000	−115, 331, 000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	*(29, 000, 000)*	*(32, 000, 000)*	*(32, 000, 000)*	*(+3, 000, 000)*	
Plant and capital equipment	262, 745, 000	[10] 426, 145, 000	380, 000, 000	+117, 255, 000	−46, 145, 000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	3, 134, 969, 000	2, 849, 645, 000	2, 688, 169, 000	−446, 800, 000	−161, 476, 000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:					
Limitation on administrative expense	*(424, 450)*	*(429, 000)*	*(429, 000)*	*(+4, 550)*	
Tennessee Valley Authority	35, 071, 000	[11] 48, 284, 000	46, 000, 000	+10, 929, 000	−2, 284, 000
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	33, 610	39, 000	38, 000	+4, 390	−1, 000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	80, 000	117, 000	117, 000	+37, 000	
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	113, 610	156, 000	155, 000	+41, 390	−1, 000
U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins	552, 000			−552, 000	
Total, definite appropriations	3, 170, 705, 610	2, 898, 085, 000	2, 734, 324, 000	−436, 381, 610	−163, 761, 000
Total, indefinite appropriations	29, 000, 000	32, 000, 000	32, 000, 000	+3, 000, 000	
Total, title III	3, 199, 705, 610	2, 930, 085, 000	2, 766, 324, 000	−433, 381, 610	−163, 761, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 66.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964—Con.

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Recommended in bill, 1964	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1963	Estimates, 1964
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Public works acceleration	[12] $850,000,000	[13] $45,000,000		−$850,000,000	−$45,000,000
Grand totals:					
Total, definite appropriations	5,497,177,610	4,520,884,000	$4,235,253,400	−1,261,924,210	−285,630,600
Total, indefinite appropriations	37,525,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	+3,338,000	
Grand total, all titles	5,534,702,610	4,561,747,000	4,276,116,400	−1,258,586,210	−285,630,600

[1] Reflects increase of $1,900,000 in H. Doc. 128.

[1a] Reflects increase of $250,000 in H. Doc. 134.

[2] Reflects transfer of $232,750 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[3] Reflects transfer of $300,000 from "Loan program" and $700,000 from "Construction and rehabilitation" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[4] Reflects transfer of $232,750 to "General investigations" and $366,320 to "General administrative expenses" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[5] Reflects $4,000,000 decrease in H. Doc. 89.

[6] Reflects $2,622,000 decrease in H. Doc. 109 and $500,000 increase in H. Doc. 125.

[7] Reflects transfer of $366,320 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[8] Reflects decrease of $4,860,000 in H. Doc. 125.

[9] Reflects decrease of $49,300,000 in H. Doc. 105.

[10] Reflects increase of $5,945,000 in H. Doc. 166.

[11] Reflects increase of $4,000,000 in H. Doc. 125.

[12] Includes $450,000,000 appropriated in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.

[13] Submitted in H. Doc. 173.

O

Union Calendar No. 377

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

[Report No. 902]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOVEMBER 15, 1963

Mr. CANNON, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

---

A BILL

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money

in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Cemeterial Expenses

salaries and expenses

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; $10,800,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of $17,000, but such limitation may be

increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further,* That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

Corps of Engineers—Civil

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, $18,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $210,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with

other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); $798,282,700, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be co-

ordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; and emergency flood control and shore protection activities; $150,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of

Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Beach Erosion Board; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; $15,000,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), $74,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manners authorized by section 19(b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and eighty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

THE PANAMA CANAL

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

OPERATING EXPENSES

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; and payments of not to exceed $50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, $25,000,000.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles for

replacement only, of which seven are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; $6,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters for non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding $16,500.

Panama Canal Company

CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

No real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

Not to exceed $9,000,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one limousine at not to exceed $6,300 and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding $30,000: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed $100 per diem.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof

or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, including not to exceed $400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to remain available until expended, $9,894,000, of which $8,621,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided,* That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further,* That $340,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $180,190,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant

to law, $38,000,000, of which $31,408,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $1,645,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, $12,217,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in

section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, $97,845,700, of which $94,036,700 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and $3,809,000 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, $10,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part

of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the

Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461–467) : *Provided,* That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations".

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those

functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular

benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed $225,000 may be expended from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

The amount of $241,160 shall be available from "Refunds and returns" for transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the amount of credits accumulated as a reserve for depreciation and/or replace-

ment of Siphon Drop powerplant, Yuma project, Arizona-California; this sum to be transferred to the Yuma County Water Users Association only after a contract providing for the custody, use, or expenditure of said money and containing terms satisfactory to the Secretary has been entered into with said association.

Bonneville Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, $36,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $13,200,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for

construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $1,000,000.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations. and appurtenant facilities. and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not

to exceed four passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, $1,500,000.

CONTINUING FUND

Not to exceed $4,500,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy, and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided,* That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available

for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000) ; reimbursement of

the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; $2,308,169,000, and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation

of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase (not to exceed four hundred and twenty-three for replacement only, including two at not to exceed $3,000 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $380,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1963, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for "Operating expenses", for capital equipment not related to construction, shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1963, of the appropriation "Plant acquisition and construction" shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $30,000,000 for a spectral shift power reactor may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the

Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to carry out such cooperative power reactor demonstration program as may be authorized by law.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1964 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided,* That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropirations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the fiscal year 1964 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is

a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided,* That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government

Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed $429,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed $2,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day: *Provided,* That not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for services of individuals employed at rates in excess of $50 per day.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including purchase (one for replacement only) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed one hundred and ninety for replace-

ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), $38,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $117,000.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. 401. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $1,950.

SEC. 402. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United

States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the

Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

SEC. 403. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. 405. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the

current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of $6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

SEC. 406. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,* That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 407. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made

to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury.

SEC. 408. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964".

Union Calendar No. 377

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

[Report No. 902]

A BILL

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CANNON

NOVEMBER 15, 1963

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Nov. 20, 1963
For actions of Nov. 19, 1963
88th-1st; No. 187

CONTENTS

Accounting.....26
Air pollution.....1
Appropriations.....2,12,26
Conservation.....7,14
Cooperatives.....30
Cotton.....5
Directives.....2
Education.....18,27
Expenditures.....8
Farm income.....3
Farm labor.....23
Farm program.....4
Federal-State relations.24
Feed grains.....16
Fish flour.....17
Foreign aid.....6
Foreign trade.....13,15
Grain.....3,13,22
Health.....19,28
Marketing.....15
Meat imports.....3
Medicare.....19
Pay bill.....20
Peace Corps.....21
Personnel.....11,20
Prices.....25
Public works.....9,12
Recreation.....14
Reports.....2
Taxation.....8,30
Transportation.....10,31
Wheat.....3
Wilderness.....29

HIGHLIGHTS: Sens. Miller, Simpson, and Morse expressed concern at meat imports. Sen. Morse inserted Secretary Freeman's speech to Grange and NAAC report. Sen. Talmade inserted speech analyzing cotton problem. House passed public works appropriation bill. Rep. Widnall urged passage of his bill prohibiting U.S. agencies from guaranteeing shipments of grain to Communists. Sen. Pearson criticized feed grains program. Sen. Saltonstall inserted article, "Fish Flour: A Miracle Tied up in Redtape." Rep. Derounian criticized administration's statements on grain diversion.

SENATE

1. AIR POLLUTION. Passed with amendments H. R. 6518, to accelerate and strengthen the Federal air-pollution control program through HEW in cooperation with the other departments, including provisions for research and grants. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 21230-48

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 8747 (pp. 21271-99). During the debate Sen. Anderson criticized "directives" in Appropriations Committee reports, stating that this is a "dangerous trend" and "substitutes the opinion of a majority of the committee for a majority of the Congress" since the reports cannot be amended on the floor (pp. 21273-4). In defending the practice, Sen. Magnuson suggested that "it is better not to clutter up a bill with too many things" and to have the executive agencies "proceed voluntarily - rather than by law" (p. 21274).

3. MEAT IMPORTS. Sens. Miller and Simpson criticized the administration for per-

mitting increases in meat imports and claimed the wheat referendum is being made a scapegoat for decreases in farm income (pp. 21252-64, 21299-300). Sen. Morse expressed concern about increases in meat imports and inserted various statements (pp. 21310-14).

4. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Morse inserted Secretary Freeman's recent speech to the National Grange and the report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission. pp. 21302-10

5. COTTON. Sen. Talmadge inserted a speech by Robert T. Davis, Jr., analyzing the cotton problem, favoring the Talmadge bill as the best solution but stating that it does not have sufficient support, and supporting the Cooley bill as an alternative. pp. 21216-8

6. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey inserted the President's speech on the Alliance for Progress. pp. 21315-7

7. CONSERVATION. Sens. Proxmire and McGovern inserted Sen. Nelson's review of Secretary Udall's book, "The Quiet Crisis," which leaves the message that we have only a "few years left to make a massive effort...to preserve our fresh water, our soil, our forests and streams, our minerals, and even the air we breathe." p. 21211, 21227-30

8. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Sen. Curtis inserted Sen. Bennett's speech voicing opposition to the idea that the "proposed tax cut, standing alone, is the key to all our economic problems" but rather urging that the tax cut proposals be "matched by a definite and specific program for the control and reduction of Federal expenditures." pp. 21218-20

9. PUBLIC WORKS. Several Senators debated the merits of the Community Facilities Act's provisions for advancing loans for public works planning programs. pp. 21248-52

10. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Douglas inserted an article, "The Affluent Railroads," which urges the railroads to modernize in order to retain their "place in the Nation's transportation complex." pp. 21224-5

Sen. Bartlett inserted an article expressing "the importance of air transportation in Alaska" as being Alaska's "way of life." pp. 21226-7

11. PERSONNEL. Several Senators discussed a possible need for an annual disclosure of sources of income and financial transactions by officials and staff members of the Executive and Legislative Branches. pp. 21264-70

HOUSE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. By a vote of 358 to 27, passed without amendment H. R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill, 1964. pp. 21170-92

13. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Widnall urged passage of his bill, which is identical to Sen. Mundt's bill, to prohibit any Government agency from guaranteeing payment for grain shipments to Communist countries. p. 21195

14. CONSERVATION. Rep. Kyl inserted an address by the Director of the Outdoor Recreation Bureau urging establishment of a land and water conservation fund. pp. 21195-8

15. FOREIGN TRADE; MARKETING. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amend-

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1963 No. 187

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT].

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not unto thine own understanding.*

O Thou infinite and eternal God, may the perplexing national and international problems, which we are daily struggling with, make us more conscious of our need of Thy divine guidance.

Help us to feel that our primary and most pressing responsibility is to lead our troubled and groping world back to Thee and the ways of righteousness.

May the Members of the Congress give clear and convincing testimony that they are men and women of integrity and inspired by a sincere desire to maintain and enhance our glorious American traditions.

Grant that the justice of God may find a voice in all their policies and plans and may they fearlessly denounce everything that is contrary to the great moral and spiritual principles.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On October 24, 1963:

H.R. 7195. An act to amend various sections of title 23 of the United States Code relating to the Federal-aid highway systems;

H.R. 7544. An act to amend the Social Security Act to assist States and communities in preventing and combating mental retardation through expansion and improvement of the maternal and child health and crippled children's programs, through provisions of prenatal, maternity, and infant care for individuals with conditions associated with childbearing which may lead to mental retardation, and through planning for comprehensive action to combat mental retardation, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 724. Joint resolution to provide additional housing for the elderly.

On October 28, 1963:

H.R. 641. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior canceling and deferring certain irrigation charges, eliminating certain tracts of non-Indian-owned land under the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 192. Joint resolution relating to the validity of certain rice acreage allotments for 1962 and prior crop years.

On October 29, 1963:

H.R. 2268. An act for the relief of Mrs. Geneva H. Trisler;

H.R. 4588. An act to provide for the withdrawal and reservation for the Department of the Navy of certain public lands of the United States at Mojave B Aerial Gunnery Range, San Bernardino County, Calif., for defense purposes; and

H.R. 6377. An act for the relief of Sp5c Curtis Melton, Jr.

On October 30, 1963:

H.R. 75. An act to provide for exceptions to the rules of navigation in certain cases; and

H.J. Res. 782. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1964, and for other purposes.

On November 4, 1963:

H.R. 844. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 845. An act to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation;

H.R. 2635. An act to amend the act of August 9, 1955, for the purpose of including the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation among reservations excepted from the 25-year lease limitations;

H.R. 3306. An act to establish a revolving fund from which the Secretary of the Interior may make loans to finance the procurement of expert assistance by Indian tribes in cases before the Indian Claims Commission;

H.R. 6225. An act to provide for the rehabilitation of Guam, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6481. An act to permit the government of Guam to authorize a public authority to undertake urban renewal and housing activities.

On November 7, 1963:

H.R. 6500. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8821. An act to revise the provisions of law relating to the methods by which amounts made available to the States pursuant to the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 and title XII of the Social Security Act are to be restored to the Treasury.

On November 13, 1963:

H.R. 1049. An act to amend sections 334, 367, and 369 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 734, 767, 769) and to add a new section 355 so as to require claims to be filed and to limit the time within which claims may be filed in chapter XI (arrangement) proceedings to the time prescribed by setcion 57n of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 93n);

H.R. 1311. An act for the relief of Jolan Berczeller;

H.R. 1345. An act for the relief of Peter Carson; and

H.R. 2260. An act for the relief of Mrs. Rozsi Neuman.

H.R. 2445. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Ray Van Olphen;

H.R. 2754. An act for the relief of Mercedes Robinson Orr;

H.R. 2757. An act for the relief of Woo You Lyn (also known as Hom You Fong and Lyn Fong Y. Hom);

H.R. 2835. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular service;

H.R. 2968. An act for the relief of Kazimierz Kurmas and Zdzislaw Kurmas;

H.R. 3384. An act for the relief of Lee Suey Jom (also known as Tommy Lee and Lee Shue Chung);

H.R. 4145. An act for the relief of certain individuals;

H.R. 6097. An act for the relief of Dr. Pedro B. Montemayor, Jr.;

H.R. 6260. An act for the relief of Wai Chan Cheng Liu; and

H.R. 7405. An act to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to vote for an increase in the Bank's authorized capital stock.

H.J. Res. 626. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the establishment of an interstate school district by Hanover, N.H., and Norwich, Vt., and to an agreement between Hanover School District, N. H., and Norwich Town School District, Vt.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that

the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2837. An act to amend further section 11 of the Federal Register Act (44 U.S.C. 311).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7431. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. CASE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL RESEARCH

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Governmental Research be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Labor Subcommittee investigating the St. Elizabeths Hospital may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit during general debate on November 19, 20, and 21.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

WHITE PAPERS VIEW THAT MESS IN CUBA

(Mr. DEVINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, it looks like the image makers are at it again. I hope I am wrong, but I am disturbed by an article which appeared in a Midwestern newspaper which states:

Two case histories of American foreign policy in action—one resulting in failure, the other in brilliant success—will be presented in two programs of the "NBC White Papers" series on the NBC television network Sundays, December 8 and January 5 (both 10 to 11 p.m.). Chet Huntley will narrate.

According to the image makers, both programs focus on Cuba. The first, "Cuba: The Bay of Pigs," will chronicle events from March 17, 1960, when President Eisenhower first revealed that he had decided to proceed with plans for organizing and training a military force of Cuban exiles, through April 20, 1961, marking the total failure of the force which invaded Cuba.

That is the one that is supposed to be a failure.

The second, "Cuba: The Missile Crisis," will cover developments from the "first" indications of Soviet activity in Cuba early in 1962 to October 28 of that year when Khrushchev agreed to pull out the missiles positioned there.

That is described as the brilliant success.

It is interesting to note that they terminate on October 28 after the President had made his speech, but apparently fail to follow through to give the whole picture where Kennedy backed off, capitulated and yielded. What a brilliant success."

These apparent "snow jobs" to rewrite history and create false images are sickening.

I am referring this matter to the Republican National Committee with the request they preview these two "white papers"; and if the facts are distorted as they were in the Newburg story and the area redevelopment film, make an equal time demand to set the record straight.

SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE PEACE CORPS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 11 of the Peace Corps Act, as amended, I transmit herewith the second annual report on operations under the act covering the fiscal year ended June 30, 1963.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 19, 1963.*

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the first bill (H.R. 2300) for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

FOR THE RELIEF OF DR. AND MRS. ABEL GORFAIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2706) for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Abel Gorfain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

CHARLES WAVERLY WATSON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2728) for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

JOHN F. MACPHAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5145) for the relief of John F. MacPhail, lieutenant, U.S. Navy.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

HANS-DIETER SIEMONEIT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1277) for the relief of Hans-Dieter Siemoneit.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill, H.R. 1277, be removed from the Private Calendar and recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6182) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This completes the call of bills on the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with my distinguished friend from Iowa on time. This subject has been so fully discussed and so clearly understood it appears to me that there is no particular object for extended debate. I wonder if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Iowa that debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by this side and one-half by the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor from the committee with almost unanimous approval of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations as well as by the full Committee on Appropriations. I am quite sure this side of the aisle will not use a full hour. However, I concur with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in approving 2 hours general debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Iowa and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 206]

Abbitt	Fogarty	Meader
Abele	Foreman	Milliken
Avery	Gill	O'Brien, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Goodling	Passman
Bromwell	Halleck	Pilcher
Broomfield	Harding	Powell
Brotzman	Harvey, Ind.	Randall
Broyhill, Va.	Hemphill	Rodino
Buckley	Holifield	St. Onge
Cameron	Hosmer	Schwengel
Carey	Jennings	Shelley
Celler	Kastenmeier	Shipley
Clawson, Del	Kelly	Shriver
Dague	Knox	Steed
Davis, Tenn.	Lloyd	Teague, Tex.
Dawson	Long, La.	Tollefson
Derwinski	Mailliard	Trimble
Dorn	Martin, Mass.	Wilson, Bob
Duncan	Mathias	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this rollcall 375 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LIBRARIES AND MEMORIALS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Libraries and Memorials of the Committee on House Administration be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The motion was agreed to.

IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9140, with Mr. BOGGS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations presents for the consideration of the House this morning the public works appropriation bill. This bill was formerly known as the rivers and harbors bill and while it now covers many subjects it is still in the main a rivers and harbors bill.

The public works appropriation bill marshals and protects and utilizes the material resources of the Nation.

When our forefathers first settled here they found a new continent possessed of apparently inexhaustible resources of every character. It teemed with game. There were deer, elk, buffalo, bear, and every species of game—that seemed to increase more rapidly than it could be consumed. Apparently it was unlimited. For three generations, in some sections of the country for the first four generations, agriculture languished. Each family planted a small patch of corn and a few rows of tobacco but their principal subsistence was game. Today many species of game which then constituted the diet of the average family is extinct. It is gone never to return.

Also, when they first saw the countryside it was covered with vast forests of trees from 100 to 200 years old. They averaged about a yard in diameter. In my immediate neighborhood there was one tree which was so large that when a horseman rode up on the stump, there was room for him to turn the horse around. This timber was rolled up into great heaps and burned. It was for the time being merely an encumbrance upon the land. But those who make accurate estimates tell us that if those logs were available today they would exceed in commercial value the value of the entire farm from which it was cut, with all its modern farm improvements.

In the great northern forests was the Minnesota white pine, the most valuable, the most easily worked, the most durable wood known to the builder. With the coming of newly invented saws they were slaughtered and floated down the Mississippi River and sold to anyone for little more than the cost of transportation. Today you can rarely secure a single stick of Minnesota pine. It has been almost completely obliterated.

There were throughout the continent vast deposits of every mineral, from coal to gold, most of which have now been exploited and many of which have been almost completely exhausted. We wasted in irresponsible and utter profligacy vast resources of every character.

But there was one resource which it took us 200 years to appreciate. When the settlers came here there were thousands of rivulets and hundreds of rivers carrying clear, pure, water to the sea. If you had told anyone that the day would come when somebody would want a drink of pure water they would have laughed at you. But, Mr. Chairman, as incredible as it is—and the statement is corroborated by official statistics—more than one-fourth of the cities of the United States are today faced with pressing problems dealing with an adequate water supply. Many of them cannot secure sufficient water to supply the daily needs of the city, and almost all who are able to secure water find it so polluted that it has to be processed before it is potable. There are cities in the United States today using water twice. After using it once, they must process it and use it a second time.

So it is evident, Mr. Chairman, that of all these vast and boundless resources which we have been wasting and dissipating, water is perhaps the most valuable.

This bill seeks to provide for the conservation, preservation and utilization of soil and water facilities.

Not only are we in need of water for domestic consumption, but in this country the development of industry has changed concepts of transportation. In the early days, civilization came up the rivers on steamboats. Everywhere the ubiquitous steamboat steamed up the river to the most remote sections of the country, carrying commerce and civilization with it. But there came a time when to our great pride, our railroads drove out the steamboats. Our railroads practically obliterated water traffic. Now we are beginning to realize again as Europe long ago demonstrated, that water transportation is the cheapest and most practical transportation available for heavy commodities. We are today under the necessity, under the pressure of modern industrial conditions, of again providing and utilizing water transportation.

On the Mississippi River, for example, my grandfather told me he remembered when there was no time during the day when you could not either see a boat or hear the deep mellow whistle of one boat miles away on the river.

The boats had carried all traffic. They carried both passenger and freight. But when the railroads came in the rivers were completely abandoned.

However, during the last war when large quantities of commodities had to

be moved and cheap transportation was important, we tried the experiment of installing Government barges on the Mississippi. It has gradually spread to other areas and while we thought it was merely a wartime measure involving an expense that could not be justified in time of peace, we discovered that barge transportation was the most convenient, most economical, and the most commodious method of transporting heavy products—oil, coal, ore, building materials and other such bulk freight and cargo.

We are steadily increasing every year the tonnage of transportation on every river in the country. I speak of the Mississippi River particularly because I live on the banks of the Mississippi and the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers are today furnishing barge transportation at so low a cost that it is doing as much to serve the interests of modern American industry as any other single factor.

So, Mr. Chairman, in this bill we propose to solve, and we are solving this pressing industrial problem. We are preserving and conserving water, the most priceless commodity of the day—liquid gold and we are encouraging water transportation and uniting and consolidating our industrial system until today it matches the water traffic of any country in the world.

Mr. Chairman, this bill may not be and, of course, is not a perfect bill, but it is making an invaluable contribution, to our times and to our national needs.

The individual municipalities and the river and harbor projects cannot meet their needs without Federal cooperation. This bill is evidence that the American republic has not only the means of providing these essentials under modern day conditions but that it has the wisdom and will and the determination and is encouraging progress that will make the United States the most prosperous nation in the world.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if you look above the Speaker's chair, up close to the ceiling you will see a plaque on which these words are chiseled:

> Let us develope the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.
>
> Daniel Webster.

Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, it is on that basis that this Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations operates year in and year out. This bill has, of course, been erroneously called the pork barrel bill. Let me say this: Every American living today should be grateful for the projects which this Congress has instituted to preserve and conserve our precious resource—Mother Earth. Were it not for the money which has been appropriated and spent for these projects, especially over the past 30 years, this Nation would be a network of gullies, as it was before the Soil Conservation Service and the Army engineers were directed by the Congress to do something about the destruction of our great natural resource—Mother Earth.

I am sure that those who have traveled in foreign lands will agree with me that had those nations that now suffer hunger, strife, and internal unrest, taken care of their lands as we have and as the Western European nations have over the past many years, then those nations today would not be suffering every kind of discomfort that one could imagine. But they forgot or the great, powerful, ruthless land barons forgot or did not care about the long range consequences if their land washed away, eroded away, or blew away, because they had a few million more acres that they could put into production. So what was the difference?

Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for the part that I have played in appropriating funds for the preservation and the conservation of our natural resources.

My friends, about 65 percent of the money which is contained in this bill for the U.S. Army Engineers is either solely for the control of floods or is for multipurpose projects that include the control of floods—floods which in the past have wreaked havoc in every section of our land and destroyed property by the billions of dollars, as well as taken many, many lives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

So, here today, we are asking the American people to spend a part of their tax dollars—and a rather small part of their tax dollars—to continue this wonderful program of conserving our priceless natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I shall insert along with my remarks the amounts which are included in this bill with appropriate comparisons with what the administration requested.

The statistics referred to follow:

Activity	Budget estimate 1964 (as amended)	Recommended by the committee	Change from budget estimate
Cemeterial expenses	$10,846,000	$10,800,000	−$46,000
Rivers and harbors and flood control	1,086,816,000	1,055,782,700	−31,033,300
The Panama Canal	33,715,000	31,500,000	−2,215,000
Bureau of Reclamation	370,347,000	348,146,700	−22,200,300
Power agencies of the Department of Interior	76,075,000	54,700,000	−21,375,000
Atomic Energy Commission	2,849,645,000	2,688,169,000	−161,476,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	48,284,000	46,000,000	−2,284,000
Delaware River Basin Commission	156,000	155,000	−1,000
Public works acceleration	45,000,000		−45,000,000
Indefinite appropriations	40,863,000	40,863,000	
Total	4,561,747,000	4,276,116,400	−285,630,600

This bill carries an amount which is $1,258,586,210 below the 1963 fiscal year appropriations. However, $850 million of that amount is attributable to the fact that there is no public works acceleration money in this bill for fiscal 1964 as there was in fiscal 1963. Nonetheless, this bill comes to the floor of the House today under the 1963 appropriations even after adjusting for this nonrecurring item, and it is under the budget in an amount of $285,630,600.

Mr. Chairman, in this bill is $2,688,169,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. I might say that it is rather difficult for the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations to analyze and determine just how much money should be appropriated to that great and important agency. But I say to the Members of the House that we worked diligently and we had long hearings, after which we marked up the bill, and you will find that as far as the items in the bill for the Atomic Energy Commission are concerned they are a total of $161,476,000 below the budget.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, I am proud to have been a party here in Congress, along with my able colleagues on the committee, in seeing to it that our natural resources are conserved, preserved and protected. We have many thousands of small watersheds in this great big country of ours. We have about a dozen main streams, main river valleys, and into those great rivers run thousands of tributaries. Mr. Chairman, it has been necessary, in order to stop floods, to build many dams on the upper reaches of those tributaries in order to hold the water as near as possible to the spot where the raindrops fall. That program has not only conserved our soil but it has conserved our water, which is so important.

Most every section of this country today is having a water problem. Most every city is having a water problem. Many small towns are experiencing a very serious water problem. So it is our responsibility, the responsibility of the Congress of the United States, to see to it that none of the rain that falls from heaven runs off the land and into the sea without helping to meet our many needs for water.

We cannot stop every drop, but we have in the past 30 years stopped most of the water that should have been stopped near the land on which it fell. By so doing we have raised the water table underground and we have made the water more valuable and more plentiful for human consumption, for animal consumption, for industry, and for irrigation.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to leave this thought with you. As I have said on many occasions, I am sure that when God made the heavens He made them perfect in every detail. But He left the earth imperfect in most every detail. He had a reason for that. Had He not done so human beings would have perished long ago because they would have become drones with never a wish to improve their lives, like the drone in

the beehive. He is finally destroyed because he is not worthy of his keep.

So, Mr. Chairman, when we talk about irrigation, small watershed projects, and flood control we have a name for that. We call it reclamation—reclaiming land that has been destroyed or ruined and in addition we are preventing the destruction of additional land. Like the rest of man's work, the bill is not perfect but it is a good bill and it will continue to improve our programs of reclamation and conservation, and the protection of life and property from devastating floods.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the ranking majority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

(Mr. KIRWAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, it is only recently, after over 185 years as a nation, that we have really come to appreciate the importance of our water resources and the urgency of taking concerted action to provide an adequate water supply for domestic and industrial purposes.

An interesting sign of the times is in nearby Virginia where they are building a town which is going to house 75,000 people when finished. The first thing they are building there is a reservoir to catch the water runoff to assure an adequate supply of water. This has greatly enhanced the value of this land.

It is the first time, I repeat, in the history of this Nation that we are on the right track in our reclamation efforts. I remember as a boy on the Susquehanna River they ran steamboats between Harrisburg and Wilkes-Barre, Pa., a distance of 100 miles. Today you could not run a canoe up that river. That shows the destruction we have had over the years.

During this past year the steel plants in Youngstown have been producing at only about 52-percent capacity, yet they were nearly out of water. And this problem of water shortage faces much of our Nation.

So the committee felt fully justified in adding 30 unbudgeted studies, 17 new planning items, and 18 new construction starts. Including the budgeted items, the bill makes provision for a total of 54 new studies, 53 new planning items, and 51 new construction starts.

I regret that it was not possible, of course, to make provision for all the unbudgeted items that were requested of the committee. About 350 Members of this Congress made requests of our committee to either raise a budget item or include an unbudgeted item. I think this is the best evidence of the need that exists today for water resource development in our country. Every one of these projects will pay back far more in benefits than they cost. Yet you often hear opposition to, and criticism of, these projects from some who claim they are not needed and are a waste of the taxpayers' money.

There is $411.7 million in this bill for the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies. Roosevelt is considered one of the greats in conservation. In 1902 he saved the 17 Western States from the robbing and looting that had destroyed many of the great resources of the East. He saved the 17 Western States. But all the money that was spent on reclamation from 1902 to 1932 was about $300 million. He saved them, but adequate money was not provided down through the years. But we now have spent billions since 1932 reclaiming this country, and I mean reclaiming it.

I repeat, as a boy I saw them set fire to the Pocono Mountains, burning trees that it took 200 years to grow.

Let me call your attention to something. Life magazine, that has several million subscribers, call this the "pork barrel" bill. I only wish they would publish the true facts about the value of these projects. Since 1902 we have appropriated about $4.4 billion for reclamation. Ninety-two percent of this is being repaid to the Government, and the tax revenues from farmers and businesses in reclamation areas now total $5.1 billion—more than the total cost of all the reclamation projects that have ever been built. In 1962, $1.2 billion worth of choice crops were produced and for every worker on an irrigated farm, two additional jobs are generated in the local towns. And yet a magazine like Life comes out and calls it "pork."

Public works appropriations have saved billions and billions of dollars for this Nation by the development of the waterways for low-cost transportation and flood control down through the years. If it was not for these appropriations, what we would have done to the greatest country in the world, and I mean the greatest, America.

I repeat, we invested $4.4 billion in the past 61 years in reclamation projects and the tax revenues that were generated now total $5.1 billion. Can any man or woman on this floor name a bank, business, utility, or anything in the world that has that record? Yet when the bill comes in you find many people talking about it as a waste of money.

I would like to quote from a letter written by a Yakima farmer which appeared in an editorial of a Wenatchee, Wash., paper:

> Wakened at 5 o'clock by an alarm clock from Connecticut, I take the milk pails (Pennsylvania tin) and wend my way to the barn, while the wife prepares breakfast on a range from Kalamazoo, Mich. The breakfast, likely as not, will consist of grapefruit from Florida, breakfast food from Minneapolis, bacon from Omaha or Cedar Rapids, Iowa, served on table china from Ohio or New Jersey, silverware from New York, sugar from Louisiana, etc.
>
> I go out to spray the orchard, using lead arsenate from Missouri, sulfur from Texas or Louisiana. My spray rig is made in Michigan, the tractor in Wisconsin.
>
> When I go to town it is in a car from Indiana and Detroit, with tires from Ohio, Bakelite for accessories from New Hampshire. My car insurance goes to Baltimore, life insurance to Des Moines and Omaha, fire to to Hartford, Conn. Shoes for myself and family come from Boston and St. Louis, clothing from New York or Chicago, cotton goods from Georgia, South Carolina, or Mississippi.
>
> And when he finally goes to the great beyond, he tells you, there will be a marker on his grave of Vermont granite that is sent all the way out to the West Coast.

So the whole Nation benefits from these projects, not just the locality. Yet we hear some say, "Oh, do not spend all that money—the budget just cannot stand it and the Treasury cannot stand it."

In every way that you can think of, for every dollar that is spent, it comes back 100-fold.

I spent about 10 years bumming all over this country—and I mean bumming over it and not riding the pullman cars although I might have been on top of the pullman car or under it. What I am trying to tell you now is that I have seen America like very few people have seen it, and there were times I got more education around a hobo jungle campfire at night when we got to talking about America than I have gotten on the floor of this Congress. Now I mean that sincerely. The group that I traveled with really saw and knew America.

A short time ago I said, and I say it again, that before issuing a passport to anybody to go abroad, I would question them as to how much they have seen of America and if the person had not seen a good part of it, he would have to pay a $200 penalty before he got his passport. If the people had a better understanding of our problems, we would be starting work on more of these projects that we are speaking about here today. I mean that. I have seen Europe several times since I came to the Congress and once before in 1917. But there is nothing in all of Europe put together to equal this country. If you see America, you will have no desire to go to Europe. That is why I am down in the well of the House here today. When the time comes to appropriate money for America, don't be haggling about it. Say a prayer, if you will tonight and make a fair confession that we have not been true to our country. I know that down through the years in the time that I have been in the Congress, I have been in favor of giving what they have asked for to this country. I hope on this bill, as it moves along, we will not find any Member of the Congress here trying to put in an amendment or to do this or to do that or hearing somebody say some unkind word. My only regret, as I have said many times, is that this bill, which is for the benefit of America, is not for $3 billion instead of only about $1.5 billion for rivers and harbors and reclamation. It should be $3 billion to try to make up for our abuse and the neglect of our country down through the years.

I hope when the time comes to vote on this bill for passage, that it will be passed here by the full membership of the House in the same way that it was reported out of the committee.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTLAND. First of all, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Ohio, as I seem to do annually, on the speech that he has just made and compliment him and the members of his

committee on this bill. I thoroughly agree that all this money that is provided in this legislation is the best kind of investment that we can make. You will find me voting for this legislation.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio knows the great interest that we in the West have in this matter of intertie for the transmission of electrical energy from Bonneville Power Administration down to the Southwest.

In the report this is referred to three different times, and I would like to make a record on this, if I can, with the gentleman from Ohio.

On page 54 you provide $5 million to be controlled by the Secretary of the Interior to begin construction of two extra high voltage lines—one that you say will connect with the California Power Pool and another one will be, I presume, a Federal intertie. But you restrict these funds to the passage of the bill, S. 1007, or some similar legislation.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio is aware, and the Congress is aware, that this bill is presently in conference with some difficulties over an amendment that carries my name.

Is it the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to restrict these funds or the use of these funds until that conference is settled or until the differences are settled—or just what is the attitude?

Mr. KIRWAN. I think it is the consensus of the committee with respect to the Westland amendment that until the bill involved finally becomes law no funds are to be used for construction. That is why we put the restrictions in there. I think it would have been much better for us if legislation had been passed that way and we could have come to a clearer understanding on the subject. However, no money will be spent here on construction until S. 1007 or similar legislation becomes law.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to thank the gentleman and his committee for having put in that language, because it certainly helps to work it out at this time.

There is one other question. On page 48 of the report you appropriate $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation and you put the same type of restriction on that $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation. Am I correct in that?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; we put the same kind of restriction on that.

Mr. WESTLAND. In the third instance you apparently have $1.5 million for preliminary engineering a—program for the interconnections to the Pacific Southwest. Is it the gentleman's opinion that the use of these funds will likewise carry the same restrictions as the $2 million for the Bureau of Reclamation and the $5 million for Bonneville?

Mr. KIRWAN. The intent of our action on this whole question was to strengthen the hand of the Secretary of the Interior in his bargaining on these tielines to see that the U.S. Government is protected. And that is what we are all interested in.

Mr. WESTLAND. We are certainly interested in protecting the U.S. Government.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. Then, if I understand it correctly, this $1.5 million has no restrictions on its usage?

Mr. KIRWAN. It has no restrictions on it, as you say, except that it must be used for engineering on lines in the Bonneville area.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The $1.5 million is restricted to the Northwest area for preliminary studies and engineering. This is the purpose for which it was budgeted.

Mr. WESTLAND. It does not say that, and I am very much interested in it.

Mr. EVINS. It is pointed out on page 887 of volume 3 of the hearings.

Mr. WESTLAND. I am glad to get that information. Do I understand that this money could not be spent outside the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. KIRWAN. That is correct.

Mr. WESTLAND. Thank you very much.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to ask some questions following along the questions of the gentleman from Washington in order to be sure I understand what is meant by the Northwest area. Do I understand this will be confined, then, to the States of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. The Northwest territory.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank the gentleman for that explanation, and may I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN]. I think he is one of the great Americans of all time and one of the greatest Americans at least of this era in his desire to see that our own domestic natural resource values are properly conserved, developed, and harvested. His contribution to the life of America will live for a long, long time. I thank him sincerely.

Mr. KIRWAN. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for those kind remarks.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GUBSER. I would certainly like to join in what the gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Colorado said about the fine, fair work that was done by the gentleman from Ohio. If he would permit me to, I would like to ask this question. Referring back to the $2 million for the California portion of the proposed intertie from the Northwest to the Southwest, should S. 1007 with the Westland amendment not become law, is it the gentleman's opinion that the $2 million could be spent for the construction of an intertie in that situation?

Mr. KIRWAN. The prohibition is that no construction be started until S. 1007 or similar legislation is enacted into law, with or without the Westland amendment. Should the Westland amendment survive in its present form, it would of course be controlling in the matter of construction outside the Bonneville area.

Mr. GUBSER. I thank the gentleman for a very clearcut answer.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield further?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to commend the chairman of this great committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and his counterpart, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and also the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for not attempting to write legislation into an appropriation bill. It so happens that the particular matter which has been brought to the attention of this Committee at this time comes under the jurisdiction of the committee which I have the honor to chair. If we cannot get the authority, then, most certainly, this money should not be spent.

Mr. Chairman, I am very grateful for this approach to the question.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my commendation to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for the constructive approach that he takes toward this type of public works and to further note the fact that the gentleman from Ohio considers this an investment in the future of America. I certainly concur with the gentleman in those expressions. In addition to that, I want to especially thank the gentleman from Ohio and the members of this Committee, on behalf of the people of the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, for the consideration they have always given us with respect to the emergency problems that we have.

I want to take this opportunity publicly to thank the gentleman and the members of the Committee very much for that consideration.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

(Mr. ROUDEBUSH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me. I shall not long impose upon the time of this body but I want to say that I heartily endorse this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to invite the committee's attention to the report that accompanies this bill, and specifically page 5 of that report. Under those items listed for the State of Illinois, there appears $250,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Wabash River Valley. I certainly commend the committee for the attention that they have given the Wabash Valley, but likewise I must express my disappointment with this

amount indicated for the comprehensive survey. It is my understanding that the Corps of Engineers has stated that they have a capability to utilize $450,000 for the purpose of this survey. However, I am aware that both the Bureau of the Budget as well as the administration asked that $250,000 be granted. Therefore, admittedly the committee has allowed the total amount requested by the Bureau. I have just returned from the Wabash Valley, where I spent two long and difficult days, visiting nearly every project that is under consideration in that watershed. May I say to my colleagues that there is so very much to be done in the field of water conservation and flood control in this area, that I feel concerned with the speed that we are attacking this problem. The overall problem cannot be resolved unless a comprehensive survey is completed, to determine the total utilization of the water resources of this, the greatest undeveloped valley in the world. A few months ago, nearly 200 members of the Wabash Valley Association came to Washington to make their plea for $1 million for this comprehensive study. This association, which is so acutely aware of the needs of the valley, expressed concern with the progress being made in the comprehensive survey. They felt and I do, that we must survey the overall problem, before we seek a cure. The Wabash Valley has suffered for many years from tremendous floods, need of channel approvement, levee construction to protect our farm lands and cities, and this year from inadequate reserves of water in the reservoir systems, to provide an adequate low flow level in the river. Lest the members of this committee might think we are lacking in gratitude, let me make it perfectly clear that we who live in and near the Wabash Valley are most aware of the efforts being made by our Government to correct this situation that has plagued us for years. But, Mr. Chairman, we had hoped that more money could be allowed to help us get along with this most necessary work in the valley. I hope that consideration can be given to the item that I have discussed, and that increased funds be allowed for this badly needed money.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH] and other members of the Wabash Valley of Illinois and Indiana concerning our interest in seeing the Wabash Valley project accelerated. We deeply appreciate the action of the committee in allowing the amount requested in the President's budget; however, we feel that the vital needs of the Wabash Valley Basin in Illinois and Indiana are so important that this comprehensive basin study should be speeded up as quickly as possible. Millions of dollars in property damage result from annual floods in the Wabash Valley; and, ironically enough, Mr. Chairman, we are experiencing a drought condition this time of year which clearly points up the need for the comprehensive study. We must find a way to harness our devastating floods and preserve this precious water at the proper locations during the low-water period. It is my intention to call this matter to the attention of the President, the Bureau of the Budget, and the other body with a hope that additional funds may be allowed in order that the millions residing in this river basin can have some assurance of protection and utilization of their natural resources. If the other body in their wisdom should allow additional funds, I am indeed hopeful my friends on the House Committee on Appropriations will see fit to agree to this item in conference. Mr. Chairman, we are urging the Army Corps of Engineers to establish a branch office somewhere in the Wabash Valley area, in order to give this great river basin the attention it requires if the above-stated objectives are met.

In closing, let me again express my appreciation to a great committee for bringing out a great bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to second the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH]. We in the Wabash Valley are appreciative of the progress that is being made there and of the fact that the bill provides $250,000 for a comprehensive survey of the Wabash River Valley. At the same time we would like to point out that the Army Corps of Engineers can effectively utilize $450,000 for the survey in this fiscal year.

I am aware that the President's budget requested only $250,000, and the committee has endorsed this figure. However, the need for this survey is urgent, and I believe we would be well advised to consider the urgency of the need.

This river valley has for years been subjected to recurrent floods. This year much of the area has suffered from an extended drought, and the combination of these natural disasters points up again the tremendous opportunity for effective water control.

Mr. Chairman, delaying completion of this survey on the Wabash River would be wasteful. True economy requires that these surveys be completed as quickly as possible so that sound plans can be based on them.

We in the Wabash Valley are proud of its role in the economy, but feel some frustration in knowing that its great resources are not being fully utilized.

We are anxious to see such things as the creation of recreation areas and a reexamination of the feasibility of making barge traffic possible.

Planning in these areas will not wait. It is obvious that new projects will be better designed if the comprehensive survey of the Wabash River is accomplished beforehand.

There are three main elements in a comprehensive river basin study. First, a determination of all needs for water and related land resources, both short term and longer term. Second, a determination of availability of water and related land resources. Third, a formulation of the best plan for applying the water assets against all of the water needs.

In short this comprehensive river basin study would seek to fully consider flood control, navigation, hydropower, irrigation, water supply, water quality control, recreation, and fish and wildlife. It seeks the best regulation of the water and land affected by it.

The need is truly urgent, and we seek urgent consideration of it so that this survey may be completed at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to pay my highest compliments to every member of this committee. They are dedicated Members of Congress. They have worked long and diligently in bringing this bill to the floor of the House.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the clerks of our committee, Mr. Culp and Mr. Wilhelm. They really represent a team that brings us the information which we need. We certainly appreciate their wonderful assistance.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I might say that our good colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN], a hard working member of this committee, is ill and so not present today. However, I am happy to report that he is coming along fine and will be back in the House soon.

I, as you know, have with me today on the minority side the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], who have worked side by side with me and with the other members of the committee in bringing this bill to the floor, a bill which we can support wholeheartedly.

There are a few things in this bill that I would have changed had I had my way. But, you know, I do not always have my way, and that is as it should be.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I, too, want to commend and thank the committee for giving the consideration to my requests in the district which I have the honor to represent.

I am certain the members of the committee recognize the many flood control problems and navigation projects that need attention in my district. The geographic location, terrain, and weather, heavy winter rains, in particular, make the area I represent somewhat unique by comparison. Approximately 40 percent of the water resources of the State of California have their origin in the north coastal counties that comprise the First District of California. I mention this to illustrate the flood control and watershed development consideration facing us now and in the future.

The members of the Appropriations Committee have been most considerate of my requests, when I have contacted you individually and particularly during my presentation before your committee. In view of the budget deficit problem facing the Congress, I believe the com-

mittee has done an outstanding job in presenting this bill to the full House.

There is one project in my district that was not included, however, that I would like to bring to the attention of the committee—the Corte Madera Creek flood control problem in Marin County. This project was not included in the President's budget and I can understand the committee's hesitancy in breaking policy to consider individual projects. However, I think it is incumbent upon me to advise the members of changing circumstances relating to projects as they arise. Then Corte Madera Creek flows near the campus of the College of Marin in Marin County. The president of the college came to my office here in Washington recently to advise of plans for expansion of facilities on their campus. At that time, he clearly defined the flood problems as they relate to his expansion plans and the restrictions placed upon them unless corrective action is taken at an early date.

Therefore, I should like a advise the committee that I plan to present my case again before the Senate subcommittee asking favorable consideration of this request and if successful, I will then ask the House conferees to sustain my request. The amount is comparatively small but the timing is of utmost importance in order to properly initiate the funding of this all-important project. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask at this time that I might be permitted to direct a question to my good friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]; but, first, I would like to say that I, representing the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, must preface any remarks I make by joining with the gentleman in his high praise and commendation of this committee.

We have been treated very well, in a continuing and an orderly development of many important projects which are in my part of the Northwest in this bill, as usual, and I too know how hard this committee works and what a capable job it has done.

However, Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disturbed that the public works appropriations bill before us today does not contain funds with which to maintain the orderly construction schedule on the Columbia Basin project in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington.

The requested funds of $3.9 million, as scheduled, would be just enough to bring construction on this half-completed project to a virtual standstill. It is the lowest appropriation in my memory.

I think my colleagues should know that when the administration's budget was prepared for submission to the Congress, the new amendatory repayment contracts with the three irrigation districts had not yet been signed. However, in ensuing weeks and months the contracts were not only signed, but were validated by the courts, thus removing the valid reasoning of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget for not recommending an additional $1.7 million for construction and operation and maintenance to keep the project going on an orderly basis.

The construction on the Columbia Basin project has been facing a slowdown for several years while the amendatory repayment contracts were being negotiated. This was only natural. The Federal Government wanted assurances from the project settlers that the Federal investment would be paid before obligating further construction. Now, however, that assurance has been given. The farmers have obligated themselves into the future and have expressed their faith in themselves and the project. The bill before us today, however, says in effect: We in the Government have no faith in you.

My good friend and colleague from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the committee, is well aware of the good faith efforts carried out by the Columbia Basin project settlers. In committee testimony my distinguished colleague has said many times, in effect, that as soon as these contracts were signed and finalized the project should go forward in an orderly manner.

I know my colleague is concerned, as I am, that the funds to do this are not in the bill.

I wondered if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa would care to comment on this situation?

Mr. JENSEN. I am pleased that the gentlewoman has brought this to the attention of the committee today. I know of her constant interest in this project and especially the part that the gentlewoman has talked about.

The fact of the matter is the homesteaders who homesteaded there in the Columbia River Basin, most of them veterans, bit off a larger chunk than they could chew at the outset. Finally the contract with the Bureau and the veterans was by necessity amended to make it possible for them to keep their land.

Last spring all contracts were negotiated and completed, but I must say it was after the budget was sent to the Congress. I do think it is quite strange that after those contracts were all negotiated, before the markup by this committee of the pending bill, the Bureau did not so inform the committee and make a request that these funds be included in this bill. But they did not see fit to do so. I think I know why. I am afraid there is a little politics mixed up in this thing. That is as far as I want to go on that. However, I am sure the Senate will include the funds that are required in order to comply with the contracts made in good faith by those people that are on that land and who have signed all of these contracts with Uncle Sam in good faith.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman. Regardless of the reason for the delay in the request of this money, I hope the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bureau of the Budget will see fit to make the request when the bill goes to the Senate and that the House Members when they understand the situation will give earnest consideration to supporting the restoration of this fund to the Columbia River development program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It there objection to request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, at almost this precise moment 100 years ago, President Lincoln arose from a sofa on a temporary stand erected at Gettysburg Battlefield, fixed a pair of iron-rimmed spectacles on his nose and read briefly from handwritten notes.

His words were set down carefully in advance. They reflected his somber thoughts on the conflict then drawing to a close and his high hopes that the conflict might contribute to a new birth of freedom and, to the permanence of self-government.

It is now regarded as one of the greatest speeches even presented, certainly the greatest ever uttered by an American.

It is appropriate that the House of Representatives pause for a moment in today's deliberations, and join in spirit, fellowship and reflection with those gathered this very moment at the same place in Gettysburg where Lincoln spoke a century ago.

Today, at this very hour, an assemblage is attending a commemorative program at which General Eisenhower is the main speaker. It dedicates anew the battlefield cemetery, and it renews our appreciation for words as well as deeds. The words Lincoln spoke at Gettysburg have become a mighty force throughout the world, serving the cause of human dignity and freedom and peace. Although totally different from the deeds performed by the brave men in blue and gray at the battlefield, they are strikingly similar in the impressive way they have influenced history.

Several of us had hoped that it would be possible to recess from legislative business today, so that all Members could have had the opportunity to be present at Gettysburg. Certainly, this would have been an appropriate gesture. Lincoln once served in this body, and to this body he looked for guidance, support and leadership during the difficult days of the Civil War.

But the legislative schedule could not be altered in time, and perhaps it is also appropriate that we stay on the job. Mr. Lincoln was a great one for wanting to get on with the work at hand. Beginning with his service in the Illinois Legislature, he believed in public improvements and worked for them. He would approve, I believe, the task we undertake today.

As the representative of part of the area once represented in this body by Mr. Lincoln, a district which also includes

the Lincoln home in Springfield, Ill., I appreciate your indulgence on this significant occasion.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, page 48 of the report contains the following restrictions on the Glen Elder project in Kansas:

None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

On page 431 of part 3 the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee there is a discussion on the Glen Elder project relative to the taking of lands in fee, in excess of those under the usual acquisition policy, such excess to be used for fish and wildlife purposes. It was indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation contemplates increasing the amount of land to be purchased in fee by 9,137 acres with this increase to be used for fish and wildlife purposes and in fact the increase is 13,527 acres over the original plan. Under unanimous consent, I include at this point the discussion on fish and wildlife costs from pages 431 and 432 of the hearings:

FISH AND WILDLIFE COSTS

Mr. EVINS. Do you know what the fish and wildlife costs will be in this project?

Mr. PALMER. The fish and wildlife costs here, the $1,696,000——

Mr. EVINS. How much land will be acquired for this purpose only? We are talking about how much land will be acquired for this purpose.

Mr. STAMM. I have some figures here, Mr. Chairman, which may answer that.

In the definite plan report prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, under usual acquisition policy, we would have acquired 24,500 acres in fee and would have taken easements on 12,600 acres for a total of 37,000.

If we acquire additional lands for fish and wildlife purposes, we would increase the fee taking from 24,500 to 33,700 acres. That is an increase of 9,167 acres, and we would decrease the acreage on which we would have taken easement to 7,400 from 12,000-plus, a decrease of a little over 5,000.

The difference in cost by taking additional land in fee rather than easement would increase the cost by $2,125,000.

Mr. EVINS. What justification is there for acquiring this land for this purpose in this area at this time?

Mr. PALMER. Here again we look to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to advise us under the provisions of the Wildlife Coordination Act.

In an amendment recently signed by the Secretary to the overall acquisition policy, each individual agency is held fully accountable for defending whatever land they want bought over and above the land that is required for the normal operation of the project.

Mr. PILLION. Am I to understand now that there is practically no restriction upon these projects in acquiring 30,000 to 40,000 acres of land here for supposed fish and wildlife?

Mr. PALMER. The 30,000 or 40,000 acres you speak about, sir, are the total acreage involved. That figure includes land to be inundated by the reservoir.

Mr. DOMINY. Nine thousand, one hundred and sixty-seven acres is where fee would be taken for fish and wildlife purposes.

Mr. PILLION. Could you make that 20,000 or 30,000 and put it in here?

Mr. DOMINY. Under the authorizing legislation if the findings of fact could be certified to as to demonstrated fish and wildlife benefits; yes.

Mr. PILLION. You take 10,000 acres and decide suddenly that someone down there is interested in building up this empire. He decides you want 20,000 acres for ducks.

Would that come under fish and wildlife or recreation?

Mr. DOMINY. Fish and wildlife.

Mr. PALMER. The determination of the land which would be required for wildlife purposes would come under that agency, Fish and Wildlife, and not Reclamation.

Mr. PILLION. Not recreation?

Mr. PALMER. We have no authority there. The only authority with this is the Congress itself.

Even this $100,000 shown here for recreation, absent some specific and substantive act of Congress, would have to be paid back by power and project users. There is no recreational authorization in this project.

Mr. PILLION. How did the $100,000 get here? Is there authority for this?

Mr. PALMER. These would be specific costs to protect the health and safety of the public and to protect the project works.

Mr. PILLION. This is recreation, $100,000. Is there authority in the legislation to put this in and to charge $100,000 for this project?

Mr. PALMER. We think so; yes, sir.

Mr. DOMINY. To allocate it.

Repayment would still have to come from the irrigation and power users, however.

Mr. PILLION. You have a right to allocate it and put it here as part of the cost?

Mr. DOMINY. To the extent that the expenditure is actually made for recreation.

We cannot allocate this to the joint cost for recreation. If we spend $100,000 for that purpose specifically we allocate it to recreation.

As I understand this restriction in the report, it will prevent the taking of any land in fee for fish and wildlife purposes on the Glen Elder project. Am I right in this interpretation of the report, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is right.

Mr. DOLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me point out, as I did before during subcommittee hearings on June 10, 1963, that consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning involves an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres; however, 7,465 acres of these lands would have been covered by flowage or construction easements. I am opposed to fee title acquisition of any additional acreage. I appreciate inclusion of the language on page 48 of the report accompanying H.R. 9140. This language will save approximately $3 million and permit this acreage to remain on the local tax rolls.

ALMENA UNIT, NORTON COUNTY, KANS.

Also, on page 48 I note a reduction of $1,597,000 made in the budget estimate of $5,580,000 in the Almena unit. The committee action deletes funds programed for irrigation features on the Missouri River Basin project, though the report indicates construction funds were provided for beginning construction of the irrigation features in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1963. Deletion of these funds comes as a surprise to those interested in the Almena irrigation unit, and while recognizing the cost per acre is high, it has been called to my attention the cost is apparently no higher now than when this phase of the project was initially programed. Information related to me today indicates many farmers in the unit have proceeded on the basis irrigation facilities would be constructed. It has also been called to my attention that the acreage involved is small, less than 6,000 acres, hence the cost per acre would not set a precedent for future irrigation projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], a member of the committee.

(Mr. ANDREWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the committee saw fit to remove the funds from the budget request for the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. These funds have been recommended by the Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget for the purpose of acquiring additional lands at the project. The new lands, together with a larger acreage of project lands already acquired by the corps, would be utilized as a national wildlife refuge for the conservation and welfare of migratory waterfowl, a Federal responsibility under international treaties. There is strong local support for the purchase—for public purposes—among the people of both Alabama and Georgia. There is strong national support among the conservationists of the Nation.

This use of such project lands, acquired by the corps along with land for other project purposes, is contemplated by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended by the Congress in 1958. Also, the acquisition of additional lands by the Corps of Engineers for this purpose was specifically authorized as an integral part of the Walter F. George project by the River and Harbor Act of 1962—Public Law 87-874.

There is ample precedent for this approval by the Congress. In the Public Works Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1962, the Congress appropriated funds to the Corps of Engineers for exactly the same purpose. This was for additional lands, and interest in lands at the Jackson lock and dam project on the Tombigbee River. Those additional lands have since been purchased, and, together with project lands previously acquired, now comprise the Choctaw National Wildlife Refuge.

Also there has been a recent and important change in the policy of the administration on this point. With letters to the Speaker and the Vice President of November 2, 1963, the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget submitted proposed legislation to govern incorporation of recreation and fish and wildlife conservation in water resources projects. Among other things, the letter and the proposed legislation give approval to the expenditure of water project funds "for land acquisition to accomplish the Federal Government's obligations to conserve and protect migratory waterfowl. These expenditures are in addition to those made from the Migratory Bird

Conservation Fund for migratory waterfowl refuges."

I sincerely hope these needed funds for the Walter F. George project will be restored to the bill before congressional action on it is completed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], a member of the committee.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, public works have made America strong and great. They have provided the sinews of much of our national strength.

Before going into a discussion of some of details of this bill, I think it is appropriate that we reflect upon some of the great federally sponsored projects of the past. These include:

The Panama Canal.

The Hoover Dam with its vast production of power.

Grand Coulee Dam that vibrates the walkway as you cross the Columbia River.

The St. Lawrence Seaway that was fought so bitterly for so long but which has brought commerce into the Great Lakes and into the heart of the Midwest.

Then I cite the Tennessee Valley Authority in my own country, which has brought us out of poverty and erosion into power and prosperity. Its achievements have won world recognition in the development and control of a whole watershed.

We have built massive dams in the Northwest to harness power and prevent floods.

We have built levees along the mighty Mississippi.

We have cleared river channels.

We have dredged harbors. We have developed America.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, how better could these Federal funds have been spent, for all of the projects I have enumerated? For the benefit of all the people of America?

This mighty Nation can well afford to invest in itself in the development of its vast natural resources.

The bill to which I address myself today has been carefully screened.

We have attempted to fit the foot to the boot of what we can afford in view of our overall fiscal obligations.

This bill—the public works appropriations bill for 1964—is one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills coming before the Congress. The bill provides for the continued development of our Nation's resources—for the overall growth and strengthening of the United States.

Appropriations included in this bill will provide funds for the civil works functions of the Corps of Engineers; the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior; the Atomic Energy Commission; the Tennessee Valley Authority; the Panama Canal; the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation; the several public power agencies, including the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration; and various water resources and study commissions.

Our committee have received thousands of pages of testimony—six volumes of hearings—from the various agency heads and their assistants and from State and local public officials, from Members of Congress and from interested citizens in connection with the projects included in this bill. The committee has done a monumental job of analyzing the requests for funds. I want to take advantage of this opportunity to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, who also serves as chairman of the Public Works Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Chairman CANNON's great experience and broad knowledge in the public works field have been invaluable to the committee in analyzing and preparing this bill.

I deem it a great privilege to serve on this committee with the gentleman from Missouri and also with the other members of our committee, including the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MILLIKEN].

The two very able and knowledgeable members of our subcommittee staff, Carson Culp and Gene Wilhelm, also should be commended publicly for their valuable assistance throughout the hearings and in handling many of the details and much of the work on this bill.

This bill carries appropriations totaling $4,276,116,400—a reduction of $285,630,600 in the budget estimates from $4,561,747,000 and a decrease of $1,258,506,210 below appropriations for fiscal year 1963. This is a cut of 6.3 percent.

The budget request provides for 51 new construction starts by the Corps of Engineers and 8 new starts for the Bureau of Reclamation—a total of 59. Included in this our committee has added 17 additional new projects for the Corps of Engineers.

Funds are provided for 25 comprehensive river basin studies by the corps, of which 22 are continuations from last year and 3 are new starts.

In addition, the committee is recommending funds for 30 unbudgeted surveys and for the initiation of planning on 18 unbudgeted projects.

Funds are provided in this bill to continue 35 construction projects to completion and to complete 4 additional projects, having a total estimated project cost of $321 million.

The total amount of appropriations recommended in this bill is $1,457,163,000, for all programs of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for 1964.

Certainly the appropriations provided in this bill represent a large sum of money, but the funds also represent a capital investment in America. This is an investment which will add overall strength to our country and bring our Nation vast benefits through the prevention of floods, through the reclamation of barren wastelands, through improved waterway systems, through increased use of our water resources, benefits of electricity, the promotion of navigation, and through the development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and for national defense.

Mr. Chairman, projects of the nature funded in this bill have recently come under heavy attack by certain national magazines and others as "pork barrelling" which some insist should not be approved by the Congress.

These critics contend that these projects are a waste of money. I disagree wholeheartedly with their thesis. They are indeed investments—wise investments in America and a proper use of public funds.

This committee each year screens hundreds of projects and recommends appropriations only for the most worthwhile. As every Member knows, a great deal of screening and eliminating of projects goes on before the matter is brought before the Appropriations Committee. Legislation must be passed, authorizing each project, before we begin our consideration on the matter of funding the projects. After this is done, we give consideration to appropriations for only the most worthwhile projects and every project must have a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio. The primary purpose of this bill is to provide funds for approved great public works projects for our Nation. I repeat, these are investments in America.

Every region and every section of the Nation will share in the projects included in this bill. It is truly an all-American bill—a bill with a national purpose—one which recognizes the needs of every area of our country.

The benefits that accrue from these projects include flood control, navigation, the generation of electrical power, the prevention of erosion, and the like. However, there is an additional, very valuable benefit which will result from the projects funded in this bill—that of providing increased employment throughout the country. This is only a side effect, but an important additional benefit and one that will mean much to our country at this time and will have long-range benefit for the future.

Approved construction projects, I repeat, are in all sections and in all areas of the United States. Besides the major construction items enumerated, $18 million is carried in the bill for numerous small projects, totaling approximately 28 throughout the country.

About 71 percent of the requested appropriations will be applied to 50 major projects in amounts of $5 million or more each.

The following table gives a breakdown of the total number of projects approved by Congress over the years; the number of projects completed; the number of projects under construction; the amounts appropriated to date; and the amount needed to complete the projects:

TABLE A.—*Number and estimated cost of active authorized projects*

	Total projects authorized	Completed	Underway	Balance authorized	Total estimated cost	Balance to complete
Activity:						
Navigation	2,511	2,277	103	131	$6,165.4	$2,764.7
Flood control	907	484	164	259	6,848.0	3,359.0
Multiple purpose projects including power	76	29	30	17	6,930.4	2,657.1
Alteration of bridges	20	17	1	2	50.5	14.7
Beach erosion control	91	33	14	44	44.2	33.3
Total	3,605	2,840	312	453	20,038.5	8,828.8

Mr. Chairman, this table shows that for navigation a total of 2,511 projects have been authorized by Congress, and of this number 2,277 have been completed, 103 are presently underway, and 131 additional projects have been authorized. The total estimated cost is $6,165.4, with a balance of $2,764.7 needed to complete.

The same situation is shown for other types of projects authorized by the Congress for the Corps of Engineers.

For instance, 76 multiple-purpose projects—large projects, including power—have been authorized, 29 have been completed, and 30 are underway, with 17 representing the balance of the number authorized.

It is interesting to note that of the total of 3,605 projects of all types authorized by Congress for the Corps of Engineers, 2,840 have been completed and only 453 remain uncompleted—and only 312 under construction.

BEACH EROSION

Regarding the participation of the Federal Government in beach erosion control projects, the existing law provides for Federal payment of 50 percent of the cost of beach erosion control works for the protection of non-Federal publicly owned or publicly used shores and up to 70 percent of the cost of protection of State and other publicly owned shores.

LOCAL PROTECTION PROJECTS

Local protection projects consist of channel improvement levees and floodwalls, emergency bank protection, snagging, and clearing work on navigable streams in the interest of flood control.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance for 1964 the bill carries appropriations of $150 million for all operation and maintenance programs of the Corps of Engineers throughout the United States.

This is a reduction of $7,368,000 from the 1964 estimates. We believe this reduction can be absorbed because of the time situation.

With these funds, operation and maintenance can be carried on on some 440 projects during next year.

IMPORTANT TENNESSEE PROJECTS

Among the great projects for which this bill provides funds to continue construction, and of particular interest in Tennessee are funds to continue construction of the Cordell Hull Dam, the Percy Priest Dam and the Barkley Dam—each named for our distinguished former colleagues.

The bill contains some $4.8 million to continue the construction which was begun this year on the Percy Priest Dam on Stones River near Murfreesboro, Tenn.

The bill also contains a total sum of $4.8 million for the continued construction of Cordell Hull Dam on Cumberland River near Carthage, Tenn. The $4.8 million total contains $3.1 million in construction funds for the dam and $1.7 million in funds for the addition of a navigation lock feature to the Cordell Hull Dam—a much-needed navigational feature for this project. The appropriations for the Percy Priest and Cordell Hull Dams will enable these projects to be carried well into the construction stage.

The bill also provides for $27 million for the continued construction of Barkley Dam near the Tennessee-Kentucky border—a valuable project which is now approximately 60 percent completed. The completion of the canal features of this project will tie the Cumberland and Tennessee Rivers together—a major engineering achievement—greatly lengthening the inland waterways of our country.

GENERAL EXPENSES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

For general expenses for the office of the Chief of Engineers, and offices of the division engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the work of the Beach Erosion Control Board, we are recommending $15 million.

FLOOD CONTROL—MISSISSIPPI RIVER

For flood control work on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, we are recommending $74,500,000.

These funds will provide for continuing work on the Mississippi River—for raising of 1,600 miles of existing levees along the main river, for enlarging or constructing 1,700 miles of levees on tributaries and side basins, and for channel improvement on the main river, for dredging of the main river to provide a navigation channel 12 feet deep and 300 feet wide from Baton Rouge, La. to Cairo, Ill.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

The Bureau of Reclamation is charged by law with planning construction and operating facilities to irrigate lands, furnish domestic and industrial water supply, and develop hydroelectric power and flood control in the 17 western reclamation States, and Alaska and Hawaii.

Total appropriations recommended are $348,146,700—an increase of $5,459,100 over the appropriation for the preceding year, but a reduction of $22,200,300 from the budget estimates.

RECLAMATION FUND

Appropriations to the Bureau are made from the general fund and a special reclamation fund. The reclamation fund is largely derived from certain irrigation and power revenues; receipts from the sale, lease, and rental of public lands; and certain oil and mineral revenues.

Total receipts into the reclamation fund since the passage of the initial Reclamation Act is $1,876 million.

In other words, there have been payments into the reclamation fund from the receipts of sales, leases and rentals of approximately $2 billion.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For general investigation for the work of the Bureau of Reclamation for next year, we are recommending $9,894,000 of which $524,000 shall be for investigation of projects in Alaska.

The committee is recommending an appropriation of $180,190,000 for construction and rehabilitation work by the Bureau of Reclamation—of which amount $75 million shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

This appropriation will provide funding for construction of some 25 major projects throughout the 17 reclamation States. The committee is recommending $38 million for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects authorized by law. Operation and maintenance will be carried on on some 40 irrigation projects.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

For the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration and the Southeastern Power Administration, the committee is recommending a total of $53,400,000 for the work of these agencies. By way of breakdown, these funds include:

Four hundred and ninety-two million dollars for Bonneville, $1 million for Southeastern; and $4,500,000 for Southwestern.

The Bonneville Power Administration, Southwestern, and Southeastern Power Administration are power marketing agencies selling the power produced on projects in their areas to rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, industrial users and others.

The profits from the sale of power by each of these agencies go into the Federal Treasury.

Revenues from Bonneville Power Administration operations are estimated at $86,900,000 for 1964; revenue from Southeastern is estimated at $23,500,000 for next year; and revenue of Southwestern is estimated at $10,800,000—or a total of $121,200,000 in revenue for the U.S. Treasury from the profitable power operations of the Government—this for 1 year only.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The largest appropriations item included in this bill is for the programs of the Atomic Energy Commission. The budget estimates for AEC for 1964 are $2,423,500,000. The committee has approved a total of $2,308,169,000 or a cut and reduction of $115,331,000 from the budget estimates.

A breakdown of the cuts and reductions by various programs for AEC is included in the following table:

TABLE B.—*Public works appropriations, 1964*

Program	Budget estimate	Amount recommended	Reduction
Raw materials	$324,843,000	$320,000,000	−$4,843,000
Special nuclear materials	480,471,000	475,000,000	−5,471,000
Weapons	782,969,000	782,969,000	
Reactor development	530,548,000	497,000,000	−33,548,000
Physical research	219,077,000	192,137,000	−26,940,000
Biology and medicine	76,973,000	68,645,000	−8,328,000
Training, education, and information	17,194,000	14,350,000	−2,844,000
Isotopes development program	9,260,000	7,860,000	−1,400,000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	15,100,000	10,000,000	−5,100,000
Committee program	10,081,000	9,331,000	−750,000
Program direction and administration	73,415,000	71,560,000	−1,855,000
Security investigation program	6,950,000	6,950,000	
Cost of work for others	6,240,000	6,240,000	
Change in selected resources	53,242,000	29,000,000	−24,252,000
Resources received from other sources	−32,000,000	−32,000,000	
Unobligated balance brought forward	−150,873,000	−150,873,000	
Total	2,423,500,000	2,308,169,000	−115,331,000

The committee has made no cuts in the weapons program for the Atomic Energy Commission. The largest reductions have been made in the reactor program and the research program for the Commission.

The Commission has been engaged in reactor development for a number of years and has by this time developed a number of feasible and workable reactors, and it is felt that the Commission should concentrate on the perfection of suitable and satisfactory reactors that have previously been developed.

The $3 million budgeted for assistance to private utilities for further work on power reactors has been denied.

It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate utilities in entering the atomic reactor field.

Reductions have been made in other areas of the Atomic Energy Commission's activities as the hearings developed that the Commission has been operating with large overruns in a number of their programs—particularly in selected resources and the purchase of needed raw materials.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The budget estimates for TVA as approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1964 included an appropriation request of $48 million for navigation, flood control, construction, and general administration.

There are no funds carried in the bill for TVA's power program. TVA's power operations are self-sustaining and self-liquidating; and as a profitable operation, returns are made into the Treasury.

TVA's construction request includes items other than power operations. These include construction of a lock at Guntersville Dam, Ala., rehabilitation of additional facilities at Wilson Dam, Ala., and completion of construction of the Melton Hill Dam and Reservoir near Oak Ridge, Tenn.

An amount of $4 million is included to begin construction of the Between the Lakes National Recreation Area in Kentucky and Tennessee.

Development of a new national park in the area, bounded on one side by TVA's Kentucky reservoir and on the other side by the Corps of Engineers' Barkley Lake—will mean a great new recreational area for our country and will be of particular benefit to the citizens living in the eastern section of our Nation.

This new resort area will have 300 miles of shore line and will offer outdoor recreational opportunities on a large scale. Since most of our national parks are in the West, this new development will mean much to citizens in the heavily populated eastern section of our country.

It is estimated that some 10 million Americans live within 200 miles of the new park area and that 70 million live within 500 miles of the Between the Lakes recreational development. The development is scheduled to be completed over a 5-year period with a total cost estimated to be $35 million.

TVA is the Nation's most profitable Government operation—not only from a dollars and cents point of view—of cash returns into the Treasury—but also from the point of view of strengthening our Nation. TVA is the world's greatest showcase of democracy in action.

I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Chairman, that TVA is a most beneficial and most profitable agency for the Federal Government. TVA is way ahead in its payments into the Treasury and last year returned out of power proceeds more than $48 million to the Federal Treasury. An up-to-date tabulation shows that in the 30-year TVA history this agency has paid back into the Treasury more than $438 million—almost one-half billion dollars.

Power savings cost—lower rates—to the Federal Government have amounted to an additional one-half billion dollars in power purchases by Government defense agencies over the past several years.

TVA thus represents a great service to the people to the seven-States area and also represents a great benefit to all the Nation.

CONCLUSION

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I repeat, this is a big bill, but a good bill—an all-American bill—providing for public works for all sections of the United States.

The projects have been carefully screened and projects with a satisfactory benefit-to-cost ratio have been approved.

The funds carried in this bill will build up America and help strengthen the security of our own country.

This bill should have the unanimous approval of the House and I urge its passage.

(Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I will yield first to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] who previously asked me to yield.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise not only to compliment the committee for the splendid work they have done but also to thank them for the very careful and sympathetic attention they have given to the harbor of Charleston, S.C., where the only Polaris base is on earth, and to thank each of them for the additional funds you have directed to be spent on a study to prevent the continued silting in this important waterway.

The distinguished chairman has taken note of this before as well as the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] who was presiding over the subcommittee at the time the Army Engineers came to testify. I notice you have given $60,000 in addition to the $90,000 budgeted. Here is the reason among other things that I take the floor. The newspapers at home carried articles to the effect that the Army district engineer in Charleston said that they had sought an appropriation of $325,000. Evidently this never got past those who control the budget for the Engineers.

I notice you gave them more than was budgeted. So he is confused as to what he wanted and what his group sent to the budget. I want to ask the chairman this question. If this $150,000 does not complete and conclude the required investigation into the reasons for the silting in this waterway, would the committee give sympathetic attention to additional funds to conclude whatever study is necessary to complete this vital study?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is correct. I will say that we on the committee are glad to cooperate and collaborate with the distinguished chairman-designate of the great Committee on Armed Services on this as well as on all other occasions.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I do not know about being chairman, but I certainly thank you for what you have said.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BASS. I would like to take this time to pay tribute to my friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] who has just addressed the Committee on this bill. We in Tennessee are fortunate to have a man of Mr. EVIN's caliber and capability and a man who is so diligent in his work representing us on the Committee on Appropriations. I want him to know that we in Tennessee, and particularly the people in my district, appreciate the efforts he makes in our behalf.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I would like to pay tribute to the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations who, over a period of years, has shown without any doubt his friendship and his loyalty to the people of my area. We are very

proud of the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and we appreciate his interest. I want to commend him and pay tribute to him, as well as to the ranking minority members of this committee. for the good bill they have brought out this year.

Mr. CANNON. I share with the gentleman his warm appreciation of the services of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS]. He is one of the most invaluable and indefatigable members of our committee. Incidentally his delightful book on Congress is a must for every congressional library.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST], such time as he may consume.

(Mr. SECREST asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the committee on an excellent bill, and I support it because I believe these improvements constitute wise expenditures of the taxpayers' money.

On May 23, 1963 in Crooksville, Ohio, I attended a public hearing conducted by Col. Harrington W. Cochran, district engineer for the Corps of Engineers in Huntington, W. Va. The hearing was called to determine the advisability of providing improvements of flood control and allied purposes along the Jonathan and Moxahala Creeks. I pointed out the desirability and the great need for this project.

On the 10th of June I appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee urging the appropriation of $35,000 for a preliminary survey of this project. I am happy that the committee approved this expenditure and that it is contained in the bill before us. I am sure it will result ultimately in great benefit to many communities in my district. These communities in the past have suffered greatly from recurring floods of these two creeks.

On the same day I urged approval of the program recommended in the budget for continued improvement of navigation on the Ohio River. I am happy that the committee has allocated the full amount requested; namely, $7 million for construction of the Belleville locks and dam, $9 million for construction of the Pike Island locks and dam, $1½ million for construction work on the Racine locks and dam, and $250,000 for planning on the Hannibal locks and dam.

These projects are of the greatest importance to the future industrial development of the Ohio Valley and my congressional district, especially to Monroe and Washington Counties that border on it.

I am extremely grateful to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the able chairman of the committee, who has done more to conserve our natural resources than perhaps any man in the history of our Nation, and to all the other members of the committee who have spent long weeks hearing testimony and preparing this appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] such time as he may require.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to yield to my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS].

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the committee for including in this bill the million dollars requested by President Kennedy for the Cross Florida Barge Canal. In my opinion, this is the most important item for Florida because it will not only help the State of Florida but the entire Nation. The project will connect the presently unconnected barge channels of the gulf and Mississippi Valley systems with those of the Atlantic Seaboard by a 12-foot by 150-foot lock barge canal across northern Florida from the St. Johns River near Palatka, to the Gulf of Mexico near Yankeetown. It will also mean there will be 2,460 miles of connected waterway uniting two great coastal areas and a bond of commerce from New Jersey to Mexico. There will be five locks with a mean summit pool elevation of 50 feet above sea level for lockage. The needed water will be supplied by pumping from lower levels, thus preventing drafts on the underground water storage. The locks will be at Inglis, Dunnellon, Silver Springs, Eureka, and St. Johns. The length of the canal will be approximately 107 miles and the time required for construction has been estimated at 6½ years. The time for construction can be greatly reduced if desirable. The total cost of the canal will be $157,900,000 with the Federal share being $145,500,000 and a non-Federal share of $12,400,000. Annual benefits from the project will be $8,256,000 and annual charges will be about $7,039,000. The project will have a benefit cost ratio of 1.17 to 1.00.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal has been a dream since the time of Andrew Jackson. The present project for a high-level lock barge canal was authorized by the Congress in 1942. It was recognized in World War II that the Cross-Florida Barge Canal was a military necessity. During this war the loss in ships to German submarines, because there was no adequate interwaterway route through Florida, was estimated at a billion dollars. This did not include the much more precious loss of American lives and this total amount does not include the cost of cargo on the ships. For years the project has had a favorable economic justification, so it fits into the criteria for these great canal projects and by no stretch of the imagination can be considered a pork-barrel project. The principal benefits from the project will result from the saving in travel distance. For most traffic that will use the project, the saving in distance will be about 360 miles as compared to the 8-foot depth Okeechobee Waterway across south Florida and 610 miles as compared to the open-water route around Key West.

The Cross-Florida Barge Canal will be of particular benefit, Mr. Chairman, to the great district that I represent, the Eighth District of Florida. The canal will cross Levy and Putnam Counties in my district and will be of great economic help to St. Johns, Flagler, and Clay Counties, all in my congressional district. Again, let me say how grateful I am for the favorable consideration of the committee for our Cross-Florida Barge Canal and I hope now that construction can begin within the next several months and that the canal can be completed in the near future. I have requested the Corps of Engineers to make construction headquarters for the canal in Putnam County in my congressional district and I am hopeful that the initial construction work may be made at the Rodman Dam in the Putnam County area.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Chairman, on March 11 of this year, the Guyandotte River in southwestern West Virginia went on a rampage. Nearly every spring, the Guyandotte River floods. Flood stage is 20 feet, and this spring the river rose to 31.7 feet—11.7 feet over flood stage. Walls of water tore up houses from their foundations, buckling the floors, ruining bedding and furniture, turning people out into the streets. This was the worst flood that ever hit West Virginia.

On page 37 of the House committee report, is contained the following language:

> The committee has allowed $150,000 of the requested $300,000 for advance planning on the Justice Reservoir project. Within this amount such funds as may be necessary shall be used for a reevaluation of an alternate flood control plan limited to realinment and improvement of the river channel, with such minor retention structures as may be appropriate in connection with such a project. It is expected that a further public hearing will be held on the alternate project and that a report will be submitted to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, $150,000 is totally inadequate for the Corps of Engineers to proceed with advance planning on the Justice Reservoir. Under the authority of the continuing resolution, that sum has already been expended since the beginning of the 1964 fiscal year and the appropriation of only $150,000 would bring all planning to a screeching halt. There would not be a red cent to carry out the very reevaluation which the Appropriations Committee directs.

Now as for reevaluation is concerned, and additional public hearings, there have been a great number of public hearings and evaluations conducted by the Corps of Engineers and the established committees of Congress since 1957. In 1962, the Congress after extensive public hearings authorized construction of the Justice Dam and Reservoir. The record of these public hearings is contained in the official documents of the Congress.

I cannot understand why the Congress would now reverse itself, and say "You must hold another hearing, another reevaluation" when the decision has clearly been made, and work on advance planning has started.

I have received thousands of letters from people who were driven from their homes last spring, and probably will continue to have their homes and businesses flooded. They have testified for the Jus-

tice Dam. They have seen Congress and its committees and the Corps of Engineers carefully weigh the opposition testimony. They have seen Congress and the Corps of Engineers come to a clear-cut conclusion. The people of West Virginia want to see the dirt fly; they are sick and tired of more filibustering on this subject.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that nothing would be gained by opening up this bill to amendment on the floor. I simply express the fervent hope that if and when the other body takes a different approach to this subject that the conference committee would consided voting the full $300,000 requested by the President in his budget, and then move forward with this project as the Congress has directed without any further delay. To do otherwise, Mr. Chairman, would be to imperil the lives and property of tens of thousands of West Virginians.

Mr. CANNON. In response to the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Chairman. I wish to point out that we are cognizant of the serious floods which have been suffered by Logan County residents and others in West Virginia. The gentleman has been very diligent and forceful in calling to the attention of the committee the needs of West Virginia, and the value of the Justice Dam. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for the additional light which he has thrown on the subject and why the Justice Dam is needed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEAVER].

(Mr. WEAVER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

PORT DREDGING AT ERIE, PA.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised to learn that funds have not been included in the budget for the deepening of the approach to the Duquesne marine terminal in the port at Erie, Pa.

A total of $743,000 is necessary to complete a dredging program authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1962. The act modified the original dredging project to provide for the deepening in the terminal sector to the 27-foot depth, the necessary minimum to accommodate properly oceangoing vessels.

The estimated project cost prior to the modification was $2,571,000. The remaining deepening is the only essential project feature remaining to be done at the port.

Completion of work on the harbor depth is of concern to industries in eastern Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and western New York. They are customers or potential customers of this fast-growing port.

To encourage ocean ships to use the facility a proper depth must be maintained.

Located in a region of heavy unemployment, Erie has hopes that its port will be a major force in restoring the economic stability of that area. A superhighway now being constructed between Erie and Pittsburgh will give western Pennsylvania industries a direct and fast route to Erie.

The development of this new ocean port has been remarkable. Some 75 acres of water lots are being reclaimed in a filling-in project to provide waterfront dock space and industrial sites. Some 750,000 cubic yards of this fill-in material was obtained from earlier dredging supervised by the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers. On May 10, 1963, a $900,000 contract was let for the construction of 1,600 feet of new steel dock space.

I hope this Congress will give serious consideration to including the $743,000 in the 1964 budget to further develop Pennsylvania's only lake port.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as commending this committee for an appropriation bill which I think is the first one we have had that is actually below the budget estimates of 1964 when those estimates were below the appropriations for 1963. I think this bill will meet the criteria I have established for what is necessary in aggregate spending in order to move toward a balanced budget. I have been voting against every appropriation bill that does not meet these standards, and I am very pleased that the committee in this instance has met these standards.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, may I commend the committee for bringing in a very reasonable and very fair bill. This bill seriously attempts to care for the legitimate needs of all authorized projects. At the same time it keeps the appropriations well within budgetary limitations. The committee has actually reduced the totals heretofore recommended. I think that the members are to be congratulated.

On the other hand, the committee has advisedly made provision for the appropriations needed to carry on work on the seven presently authorized watersheds where authorization authority has become exhausted. That we may all understand the situation, let me explain that it has been the practice of the legislative committee on especially large river basin projects to authorize the project but only to authorize a limited expenditure at a given time. Normally, additional authorizations are made so that these river basins never impose an undue burden on the total in any one year. This year there are seven major river basins in the United States that are running out of authorization authority. One of these is the Brazos River in Texas.

Like most of the other river basins, work has been going on for a good many years. There are presently at least four major dams under construction for the completion of which there is not adequate authorization authority. To stop work on these dams would be tremendously expensive. We all know that ultimately the work would be completed but the legislative committee of the House recognizes that in order to save money—some have estimated as much as $20 or $25 million—this work should continue without stoppage and the committee brought in a bill earlier this year authorizing continuation of these projects. The bill actually contemplated authority to complete at least a large part if not all of the projects.

The other body sought to limit this authorization authority to the fiscal year. Of course, that enabled them to greatly reduce the total authorization, but they used this saving to authorize additional projects, some of which had been rejected in the past and none of which had been approved or even been finally heard by the House committee.

In an effort to compromise with the other body, the House again passed a bill using the Senate's identical figures as to amount and duration of authorizations but removing the new and inadequately considered projects. Of course, by limiting the authorizations to 1 year the bill gave assurance that there would be consideration of new projects next year.

I had hoped that the other body would accept this effort to compromise in the spirit in which it was made. Unfortunately, so far it has not been accepted. I am still hopeful that sound judgment will prevail and that the other body will accept this compromise.

In the meantime, the bill presently before us makes appropriations available to continue the work on these river basin projects if, as, and when authorization is secured. I believe that the committee has done well in including these appropriations. I commend the membership and I would express hope, in which I know most of the Members of this body join me, that our colleagues across the Capitol may see fit to concede on one part of their views, particularly where this body is offering to accept their figures and timing in its entirety on all of the original projects.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], a member of the subcommittee and a member of the committee, such time as he may require.

(Mr. WHITTEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, being a new member of this subcommittee, I wish to join in the statements that have been made about my colleagues on this committee, beginning with the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the subcommittee, and of the full Committee on Appropriations [Mr. CANNON]. It has been my privilege to serve with him many years here, and I have never seen anyone work harder to get a dollar's value for a dollar spent. In this bill he clearly shows that a dollar spent on his own Nation is a dollar well spent.

It has been especially pleasing to me to serve this year on this subcommittee dealing with domestic public works, where all members are conscientious believers in conservation of natural resources. For many years it has been my privilege to be chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on

Appropriations handling agricultural appropriations, where we deal with soil conservation and watershed development and flood prevention. In fact, one of the things of which I am most proud is that in 1952 I went before the Democratic Convention in Chicago and got them to adopt a plan to take care of watersheds for this Nation. We did not happen to win that year, but our subcommittee, without budget approval, provided $5 million to set up 56 pilot plants over this Nation. That was the beginning of the great watershed program we have today which is doing so much to reclaim and develop this Nation.

The companion part of the watershed effort is handled by our Subcommittee on Domestic Public Works. Funds for development of rivers and harbors and the major parts of the water system in which the watersheds happen to flow are in this bill. So it is doubly pleasing to me to have a chance to work with my colleagues here who have done such an outstanding job in this area throughout the years.

I am being repetitious in recalling to the Members this illustration, but it stands out to me like a ringing bell. Some years ago when I had the privilege of presiding at a hearing on an emergency appropriation bill, when we were trying to provide that the United States would have ample production facilities to meet an all-out war with Russia, as we walked back over from the hearings, the head of the office handling that matter, Joe Fowler, said, "JAMIE, if I were Joe Stalin"—and it was in Stalin's day—"I would declare 10 years of peace." He said, "Think what it would do to this country if we were to suddenly recall all of the men from the service and they were out of jobs. Think what it would mean if we closed down the factories that were manufacturing munitions. Think what it would mean if we stopped the export of agricultural products which we are exporting because of the threat of war, and you could see that it would mean economic chaos."

Yet, Mr. Chairman, you could see he apparently was right. Even though we had the greatest material prosperity in history, we could not afford to admit that you had to have war or preparation for war in order to have material prosperity. But, my friends, if you will think that statement through, and I repeat this now because we are hearing a lot about the necessity of cutting out foreign aid, calling our troops back home, and many other things because of the balance-of-payments situation, after you think through what he said, you realize that it is not war or the preparation for war that brings prosperity. It is the extra effort because of it.

Mr. Chairman, where in war you burn up your gasoline and destroy your planes, and use up other war materiel and end up a poorer nation, if we were wise enough to put forth that same effort in developing and protecting our great river basins, our harbors, replanting our forests, in building roads and schools, and the many other things so necessary for our domestic development, we could have prosperity and have a much richer country.

Mr. Chairman, I mention that because if I judge present conditions right and the statements which I see and the reports from our Treasury, we are going to have to divert our efforts from foreign aid and other things. If we will do that and spend our effort on our own country, we will end up richer for every dollar we spend.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], for giving me the privilege of serving on this great subcommittee, whose interest is serving America first, last and always.

With regard to the details of the bill, I quote here from the committee report, page 41, as follows:

> The reduction which the committee has made includes funds for five new positions requested and the $50,000 budgeted for the Cache River project, Arkansas. The latter amount was for an advancement to the State highway department for added costs of Highway No. 64 bridges across the project in order to meet the project dimensions should it be built. If built, the project would be of general benefit to the State and the committee sees no reason why the State should not stand this added cost, if it wants the project.
>
> Lower Mississippi operations: The operations of the Corps of Engineers at Greenwood, Greenville, and Natchez in Mississippi, have been very effective and efficient for years, and no action shall be taken to remove operations which have been carried on from these locations.
>
> Yazoo Basin project, Mississippi: The counties which suffered road damages by reason of building the Sardis Reservoir executed a full release for such damages at the time. It appears to the committee that the amount paid is unreasonably small, as compared to the value of the Teckville crossing to adjacent counties. It is the opinion of the committee that if the State should provide a first rate or primary through highway by way of the former Teckville Crossing, the Corps of Engineers should reopen the matter of prior settlement as authorized by Public Law 526, 79th Congress, and make additional contributions above the usual 50 percent for constructing a crossing in line with the value of the crossing destroyed.
>
> The committee directs the corps to keep open the streams which run into the Arkabutla, Sardis, Enid, and Grenada Reservoirs, and that Federal lands in such areas under the control of the corps shall be handled in such a manner as to enable lessors to operate in such a way as to maintain and develop such lands.

Mr. Chairman, those statements of the Appropriations Committee speak for themselves and are amply justified.

With regard to efforts of the corps to move work affecting many families from Greenville and Natchez, thereby affecting Greenwood, the work has been handled very satisfactorily at these locations for years. A concentration at Vicksburg could well lead to later efforts to handle this huge stretch of river from Memphis and New Orleans, and eliminate Vicksburg. We are opposed to taking any action toward such removal. Present officers may say they have no such intentions—but they will not be there forever.

With regard to other matters covered, these are matters where in most cases the Corps of Engineers has been very cooperative. However, the people in the areas of these reservoirs at the time of construction were led to believe that lands would be leased back at reasonable rates and under such terms as to enable the lessors to protect and develop the lands and prevent the filling of reservoirs, and that the streams entering the reservoirs would be kept open.

On the Teckville Crossing, the corps paid approximately $37,500 to Lafayette County for all road damage, for which the Government got a full release from the county.

Now the corps admits that while the construction of a crossing would cost more than its value with existing roads, the corps agrees that a crossing would be worth more than $3,500,000. After all, Mr. Chairman, other counties have an interest.

Fortunately Public Law 526, 79th Congress, does permit the corps to reopen the matter as directed by the committee in case a primary highway is built.

Whether the State will do this I do not know.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate being on this subcommittee and look forward to being on it for many years. I certainly shall give to these programs my very best efforts to protect America for its people of today and its children of tomorrow. I know if we leave to our children a nation rich in natural resources they will make it fine.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAY].

(Mr. GRAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I think the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I could not allow the occasion to pass without joining today with my other colleagues in commending the very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and the members of his fine committee for bringing out a very, very good bill.

I have the privilege of representing a congressional district which is bounded on both sides by two of the great rivers of the Nation, the Mississippi on the west and the Ohio on the east, and four major river basins in between.

These basins are the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, the Kaskaskia, Saline River and tributaries, and the Wabash River and tributaries. These basins hold not only great economic hope for the area through navigation improvements, reservoirs and water impoundment, recreation, and many other benefits, but they also hold, Mr. Chairman, great hazards against loss of life and property if they are not harnessed properly to prevent major floods. Without the sympathetic understanding of this committee, we could not proceed with the development of our natural resources and provide the millions of people in this area with proper flood protection. I am particularly grateful to the committee for allowing funds with which to continue advanced engineering and design planning for the Rend Lake Reservoir,

the funds for advanced engineering and design planning on the Kaskaskia River navigation project, the funds for a comprehensive study of the Big Muddy River and Beaucoup Creek, funds with which to make a comprehensive basin study of the Wabash Valley area, and funds with which to provide flood protection along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. We are also looking forward to seeing the replacement on an accelerated basis of the High Life Dam at Mound City, Ill., on the Ohio River.

I want to publicly commend, on behalf of the more than 10 million people of Illinois, the committee for doing an outstanding job. I also want to single out the great staff of the committee, Mr. Carson Culp and Mr. Gene Wilhelm. I have never called them about any matter but what I received their sympathetic consideration. They are always available and able to be of assistance. To all of you we say "Many thanks."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER].

(Mr. WAGGONNER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill for 1964.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and all the other committee members for their diligence in preparing and presenting this legislation to the House for consideration today. It is comprehensive and worthwhile. To be sure a great deal of money is involved but the dividends which will accrue to us and future generations will be multiplied many times over. Looking beyond today and to tomorrow, we must not fail to pass this appropriations bill today.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN].

(Mr. ULLMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my personal appreciation to the chairman and members of this important subcommittee for their diligence in bringing us this impressive legislation. I want to particularly congratulate the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] for his great speech here today on behalf of the development of our Nation's resources. No one has spoken more eloquently of the importance to every American of the conservation and utilization of the vast water and land resources of the West. He is indeed one of the greatest friends of the West this Nation has ever had. The Nation has a great stake in the future of its natural resources. This legislation is wisely considered and well presented. I congratulate the committee and urge unanimous approval by the Members.

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for the report it has filed on the civil works appropriations bill, and particularly that section relating to the Atomic Energy Commission.

I am particularly delighted by the statement in the committee report to the effect that nuclear power technology has advanced to the point where Government subsidies can be done away with.

There is absolutely no justification for the spending of Government funds to subsidize the construction and operation of large commercial nonexperimental nuclear powerplants. Unfortunately, this is what has been done in the past. It is my hope that the acceptance of this bill by the House, backed up as it is by this strong statement against further Government subsidy, will mark the end of this phase of our civilian nuclear power program.

Let me make it clear that I am not appearing here today in opposition to the Government research and development work on reactor concepts which show promise of being successfully adapted in the future for the production of electricity. I am sure that my fellow members of the Appropriations Committee who reported out this bill also feel that research and development work in the civilian nuclear power field must be carried forward.

But I am unalterably opposed to using the taxpayers' money to subsidize the construction and operation of large, commercial-size nonexperimental plants embodying a proven reactor concept. If I read the Appropriations Committee report correctly, the only subsidies which will be affected are those which would go to this type of plant. After all, the pressurized water and boiling water reactors are the only ones regarded as proven and, therefore, eligible for Government subsidy in the construction and operation of plants.

At least two large, commercial plants using reactors of this general type are now in operation. Yankee Atomic, at Rowe, Mass., has been operating for more than 2 years. Although it was built with Government subsidy, the combine of private utilities which own and operate it do not consider it an experimental plant. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York built a 230,000-kilowatt plant at Indian River without Government subsidy. Company officials state the plant is a part of its system, a base-load plant, and not experimental in any way.

Yet, despite the existence of these two plants, and assurances from utility executives that pressurized water or boiling water reactors can produce electricity competitive with electricity produced in fossil fuel fired plants, the Government is going to spend $42 million in direct subsidies for the construction of three new nuclear plants in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt range.

The contracts for these plants are now being worked out by AEC. They will not be affected by the passage of this bill. The effect of this legislation will be to put an end to Government subsidy for the construction of any other additional plants of this type and size.

The boiling water and pressurized water reactors are now old hat. Both General Electric and Westinghouse are out trying to sell conventional reactors to private utilities, the same as they are trying to sell conventional fuel plants. These two companies are not offering experimental plants; they are trying to sell commercial plants for the production of commercial electricity.

The Atomic Energy Commission has done its job, and done it well, insofar as these water reactors are concerned. They have developed the technology. Prototype reactors have been built and operated. Private industry, on its own, has taken this AEC-developed technology and built with its own funds large plants to produce electricity that is sold to its customers in the same way, as electricity produced from coal, oil, or natural gas.

Government participation in the pressurized water and boiling water reactor program should have ended right here. If private utility companies are convinced that powerplants using reactors of this type are sound, they will be built. It does not take a subsidy to induce private business to engage in sound business practices.

I do not believe the continued subsidization of these large, commercial nuclear electric plants is compatible with the spirit of the Atomic Energy Act. It was always my belief that the AEC role was confined to the development of the technology of the various reactor concepts and making that knowledge available to private business for exploitation. Surely, it is not within the province of the Commission to spend taxpayers' money to insure that the end use of Government-financed research and development work will be competitive or will be priced below products and goods already in the mainstream of American business.

Yet, I am afraid that in essence what AEC is doing is holding out the offer of sizable Government subsidies to encourage the building of large, commercial nuclear plants. It is my understanding that the president of the company which will build one of the three large plants I referred to earlier frankly stated that, without the Government subsidy—around $14 million in the case of his plant—he doubted that his company would have gone into this project.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me once again affirm my support of the Appropriations Committee action taken on the AEC funds for the 1964 fiscal year. The committee has acted wisely. I trust this House will give unanimous support to the provision of the bill which eliminates unjustified subsidies for proven, commercial nuclear powerplants.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the Appropriations Committee for its recommendation that $33,548,000 be cut from the reactor development program budget in the Atomic Energy Commission's budget. I particularly am pleased that this action obviously stems from the committee's awareness that nuclear power subsidies are in need of drastic curbing. In the committee's report we find this statement which I consider significant:

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of

power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

I understand that, in line with this opinion, $3 million for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors has been also deleted in the committee's recommendations.

I would like, however, to ask the Appropriations Committee if there are any funds still in the reactor program budget which are available for research, development, and design assistance on commercial-size proven reactor concepts? Specifically, is there any money included in the budget that could be used for subsidizing the design of more water-type reactors?

It is important that clearcut answers to these questions be made a part of the RECORD. There is no doubt in my mind, from a careful reading of the committee report, that the Appropriations Committee concluded that the time has come to end subsidies for the water reactors. I would like to see a specific prohibition against further subsidies for these plants written into the bill to remove any possible doubt about the intent of the House on this matter.

But lacking such a clear-cut prohibition, I would like to have assurances that the committee's recommendations, if adopted by this House, will accomplish the same purpose—that is, ending the subsidy for large, commercial water reactors.

The continued subsidies by AEC of the building of large, commercial-size nuclear plants, it seems to me, contradicts the original intent of the Atomic Act.

Take the three new plants which were recently approved by the AEC and for which $42 million in assistance will be spent by the Government. Are these plants prototypes? Are they experimental? The answer is "No." Each of them is of the same reactor concept. Some slight variation in design, but all are in the 400,000- to 500,000-kilowatt-size range. All are pressurized water reactors.

But the AEC's own words in its report to the President for 1962 on the civilian nuclear power program, pressurized water reactors are safe and of proven design.

Moreover, there are many reactors of this type in commercial operation. One, the Consolidated Edison Indian Point plant, is of 275,000-kilowatt size.

This type of plant, the AEC tells us, can compete with fossil fuel plants in high-fuel-cost areas. This should prove a sufficient inducement for private utilities to build them with their own money—without any Government subsidy.

I maintain there is no need for urgency in the Nation's program to build nuclear plants. There is no power shortage now or on the distant horizon. There is no possible shortage of low-cost domestic fuels for hundreds of years.

As a representative of an oil and gas, as well as coal producing State, I deplore the policy of the AEC which seems to be that "anything goes" in the way of subsidy so long as it gets nuclear plants built.

Spending our taxes to force on unneeded industry into competition with our vital, unsubsidized domestic fossil fuels industries is one of the greatest inequities Government can commit.

I would like to see in the future a closer adherence by the AEC to the original intent of the Atomic Energy Act. Once it gets a nuclear plant designed, researched, and developed, and possibly a small prototype built, let it turn the building of a large, commercial electric plant over to private utilities.

The AEC should set itself some specific guidelines as to when a nuclear concept has been proven. And when this point is reached, say to the utility industry, "This is a proved concept, it is safe, it is economical. You take it from there."

I do not oppose the development of nuclear power. But I do vigorously oppose "paying the way" for getting commercial-size nuclear plants into operation once they have gone beyond the experimental stage.

I hope the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee will be adopted. I hope, too, that they will accomplish what is long overdue—the curbing of subsidies to nuclear plants that have been proved safe and economically feasible.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, for a number of years I have been speaking out, like a voice in the wilderness, against what I regard as the unwise and unsound policies of the Atomic Energy Commission in regard to civilian nuclear power. I have particularly opposed the subsidization of the construction and operation of large, commercial plants—not prototypes or experimental plants but full-scale commercial operations—which are then able to compete, because of the size and scope of the Government subsidy with privately owned and nonsubsidized powerplants fired with coal and other fossil fuels.

I represent a major coal producing region. In my opinion, this whole civilian nuclear power program affects the jobs of thousands of men and women in my district. It has serious implications for the entire coal industry. Electric utilities provide the largest single market for coal. It is the growth market for coal. If the size of this market—today and in the future—is limited by nuclear power, conceived and nutured by Government funds, then the Government by its own actions will have seriously affected one of the Nation's basic industries.

What the Appropriations Committee has proposed in its report on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriations is not going to sound the death knell of the atomic program. But it is going to cause a lot of people, in and out of Congress, to take another look at this multibillion-dollar program.

The Appropriations Committee will serve the most useful purpose of focusing the attention of this House and the other body—as well as the public—upon the one aspect of the program which has been neglected for too long. I refer to the granting of subsidies from the public treasury to induce the construction of large, commercial nuclear plants. This is what I have objected to. This is what the coal industry objects to so strenuously. The proper role of Government needs to be carefully defined. The action of the Appropriations Committee is a step in that direction.

Is it the proper role of the Atomic Energy Commission to spend hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars developing a certain type of reactor and then spending additional millions to get these plants built and placed in commercial operation?

My answer is an emphatic "No."

Apparently, the Appropriations Committee has now taken this same position.

The Atomic Energy Commission has spent to date in excess of $1,300 million on the civilian nuclear power program. The continued annual expenditure is at a rate of about $200 million a year.

Out of all of this vast Government research have emerged reactors which can produce electric power. The Commission states they are safe to operate. Chairman Seaborg has stated that he would not mind living next door to one, so safe have they become. The Commission has had particular success with pressurized water and boiling water reactors. In its report to the President last year on civilian nuclear power, the Commission said, and I quote:

> They are reliable and safe. It is believed that large reactors of these types could now be built and operated in high-cost fuel areas with a lifetime promise of greater economy than conventional fuels. Even better economics can undoubtedly be achieved in the future from better fuel performance and other general improvements.

In view of this statement, I was puzzled as to why the Commission considered it necessary to participate in the construction of three huge plants of this type.

Recently, Chairman Seaborg, in a letter to me, stated without qualification that the pressurized water and boiling water reactors have been proven. Here are his words:

> A reactor concept is considered proven when it has been developed to the stage where engineering feasibility has been established or where reactor experiment or prototype experience has demonstrated confidence in reactor reliability for the general size contemplated. The pressurized and boiling water reactors are examples of proven concepts, although there could be design variations which might fall outside of the proven category.

You will note that once again Chairman Seaborg states these reactors are safe. The engineering feasibility and the reactor reliability have been clearly established, he assured me.

Is it not reasonable to expect that once this stage of advanced development has been achieved—and after similar plants have been successfully built and operated on a slightly smaller scale—that the Government would step out of the picture?

Unfortunately, that has not happened. A number of months after the

Commission reported to the President that the water reactors "have arrived" the Commission came to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and obtained permission to build three more plants—not by any stretch of the imagination experimental plants or prototypes embodying some entirely new concept—but plants using the same proven water reactors. The total direct subsidy involved is in excess of $42 million. These plants will be built and the kilowatts they produce will be sold in competition with coal-produced kilowatts.

Where will this subsidization of commercial nuclear plants end? Would not the public interest best be served by devoting this $42 million to further research into breeder reactors and other concepts than by using it to subsidize commercial plants? I think the AEC should be put on notice that money to finance nuclear research is not inexhaustible. We have a tremendous national debt and every few months it seems this House has to face up to the painful necessity of increasing the ceiling on that debt to avoid financial chaos.

Forty-two million dollars may not appear to be a lot of money to AEC, which deals in billions, but unfortunately, too many agencies of the Government have adopted this same attitude toward the "small" amounts and have not made any real effort to save money. If strict standards for spending Government money had been adopted by the AEC and all other agencies, the continuing financial crisis this Nation faces could at least be considerably diminished. I happen to think $42 million is worth saving, especially when not spending it will have no adverse affect on the public interest.

As I have stated, these three commercial powerplants, with proven water reactors, will be built regardless of what the House does on this appropriation bill.

The important thing is for Congress to let the Atomic Energy Commission know that it does not want any more of this type plant built with Government subsidy.

If the water reactors "have arrived," if the engineering feasibility and the reactor reliability have been clearly established, if commercial plants of the same design and size have been built and operated by private industry without subsidy, if these reactors are proven, then what reason is there for spending Government funds for the building of more of these plants?

Is it the proper role of Government to insure through a subsidy that nuclear plants will produce power cheaper than conventional plants?

I do not think it is. If nuclear powerplants of this type are technically feasible and they are needed, private industry will build them. And they will build them without the Government holding out a carrot in the form of a subsidy.

Mr. Chairman, no one that I know of is asking that the AEC be forced to get out of the business of developing and proving out the various reactor concepts for producing electricity.

What I am demanding is that the AEC stop force feeding the development of nuclear electricity through Government subsidy of commercial, nonexperimental plants. Let the AEC confine the activities to its research and development field, as Congress clearly intended.

The private utility industry is fully capable and, I am informed, perfectly willing to adapt this technical knowledge—the fruit of Government research—to the commercial production of electricity if and when the economics of the situation and the demands of the Nation for electric power so dictate.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended for its action on the Atomic Energy Commission appropriation. Undoubtedly, the committee will be charged with scuttling the civilian nuclear power program and setting back progress. This is a lot of nonsense. All the Appropriations Committee has done was to restore a sense of balance to the program. It is forcing the AEC to get out of the subsidy business, a step which the Commission should have taken without this prodding from Congress.

The civilian nuclear power program will continue after this bill passes. But first things will be put first. This bill will force AEC out of the power business and back into the laboratory, where it belongs.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to bring to the attention of the House, an action of the Appropriations Committee which I believe may go further than was intended. It is an action which may not only cripple a truly worthwhile scientific endeavor, but may ultimately cancel out the very savings which it is intended to achieve.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION

In the course of its review of the AEC appropriation—which is contained at pages 21–25 of H.R. 9140—the committee cut out the entire $15 million appropriation intended for new projects under the so-called cooperative power reactor demonstration program. Three million dollars would have been spent in fiscal year 1964 while the remaining $12 million would have been obligated in future years.

Mr. Chairman, the practical effect of the committee's action is to wipe out the possibility of future projects in the cooperative program. It is a severe blow to participation by private industry in the development of atomic power.

Why do I say "severe blow"? The cooperative power reactor demonstration program is the vehicle which makes it possible for private industry—for reactor manufacturers, for utilities, public and private—to play a role in developing atomic power. New reactor types may be risky financial propositions. They, of course, are not expected to produce economic power—this is not their function.

But if we provide some limited assistance to the utilities, they may be willing to invest the much larger sums which are necessary to get these reactors built. This is the theory of the cooperative program—it is a partnership approach to developing the atom.

REASONS FOR THE COMMITTEE ACTION—STATUS OF NUCLEAR POWER

In its report on the AEC appropriation, the committee states the reason for its action as follows:

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel costs.

Mr. Chairman, there is much truth in the statement of the Appropriations Committee. We have made very substantial progress in developing economic nuclear power—particularly in the field of large, so-called water reactors. But even in this field, a substantial amount of work remains to be done. The AEC recognized the fact in its November 1962 report to the President, where it stated:

> Certain classes of power reactors, notably water-cooled converters producing saturated steam, are now on the threshold of economic competitiveness with conventional power in large installations in high fossil fuel cost areas of the country.

Mr. Chairman, there is a substantial difference between the statement of the Appropriations Committee and that of the AEC. The plain fact is that despite our very impressive progress, nuclear power has not been demonstrated to be competitive with conventional sources at this point in time—it is close, but not yet "over the top."

Moreover, there are other reactors still in the very early stages of development—research must be done and prototypes must be built in order to explore the potential of these new reactor types. We must get on with the task of developing advanced concepts—particularly the breeder reactors which produce more fuel than they consume. Surely, we do not intend to "freeze" private industry out of this critically important program. Our Government laboratories are doing brilliant work, but certainly we do not want to shut out the genius and initiative of private industry.

JOINT COMMITTEE VIEWS

Mr. Chairman, I have sat as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for almost 20 years. As I indicated before, the joint committee this year recognized, as does the Appropriations Commtitee, that water reactors are nearly economic. For this reason, we indicated our strong view against permitting the AEC to go ahead with further assistance for large water reactors, in reporting out the AEC fiscal year 1964 authorization bill. In counseling the AEC not to issue a second invitation for utility design assistance proposals, we stated:

> If this invitation were to be made this year, it appears most certain that a water-type reactor would, of necessity, be the only type to qualify as proven under the Commission's criteria. In order to diversify the technology, the committee believes it would be desirable for other reactor types to have the opportunity to compete for this form of Government assistance. Several different reactor types are expected to come into operation in the near future. Although the degree of their success cannot be predicted now, it is possible that one or more could be considered at the time of a later invitation under the modified third round. This possibility indicates the wisdom of delaying the second invitation under the modified third round for at least another year.

There is no quarrel between the Appropriations Committee and the Joint

Committee on Atomic Energy on this point. We are in full agreement. But, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, we have a long way to go in developing economic nuclear power, particularly in connection with the development of advanced concepts.

THE ROLE OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY

If we allow private industry to play a role in this program, we not only save millions for the Government which would otherwise be required for Government construction of these plants; we assure that the development of atomic power will proceed in accordance with the sound principles of the free private enterprise system. We do not subsidize uneconomic power—we allow a free economy to work its will, in partnership with Government.

Mr. Chairman, if I may just cite one example. The Appropriations Committee wisely permitted an additional $3.5 million over the request of the AEC, for the so-called seed and blanket reactor—a very promising concept being developed by Admiral Rickover and his people. Some day we may wish to construct a full prototype of this reactor. Such a project would cost the Government $90 million if constructed entirely with Federal funds. But, utilizing the machinery of the cooperative power reactor demonstration program, a utility might be expected to put up a substantial portion of the cost of such a project, with corresponding savings to the Government.

IMPORTANCE OF DEVELOPING NUCLEAR POWER

Mr. Chairman, the cooperative power program is essential if we are to get on with the critically important job of developing atomic power. The importance of the task ahead was recognized as early as 1957 by the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Speaking on the floor on April 16, 1957, he stated:

> We must develop as rapidly as possible every potential source of electric and atomic power. A century from now or sooner, these potent sources of energy will be decisive in world survival.

Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago, the House approved in excess of $5 billion for the space program. Even its most ardent supporters are hard pressed to spell out the practical advantages of this program. When we are ready to spend billions for space, we certainly do not want to deny a few million for a modest research and development program which can bring a third great source of energy to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, it can certainly not be the intention to cripple this program during a critically important stage in its development. For this reason, I am sure that there has been a misunderstanding here—one that can be remedied. I expect that the AEC will appeal this decision to the Appropriations Committee of the other body. Even if not all the money requested by the AEC is restored, I am sure that a sensible compromise can be reached which will permit the continuation of the partnership approach to the development of atomic power.

The remarks I have made in reference to this program are fully supported in a letter directed to Senator PASTORE, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, by the Honorable Glenn T. Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. I ask unanimous consent to include that letter as a part of my remarks.

The letter from Dr. Seaborg follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1963.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: You have asked about the current status of the achievement of economic central station civilian nuclear power.

There are several large commercial nuclear powerplants employing light-water moderated and cooled reactors now being planned for utility construction which have projected power-generating costs competitive with conventional plants in areas of high fossil fuel costs; but there are no plants on the line today which are producing power competitive with conventional fuel costs.

It is our belief, however, that the technology of light-water reactors, such as are now being built, has reached the point of development where they can be expected to be economically competitive in large sizes in some high-cost areas. It is to be hoped that subsequent continued improvement of light-water power reactors by industry will result in their economic application to broader geographic areas than those of the highest fossil fuel costs, and that further support by the Government might be avoided. It is to be noted, however, that the economics of such plants have not yet been demonstrated, that there is a lack of long-term experience in their construction and operation, and that there is financial risk to the utilities in undertaking the projects particularly in the economics of the nuclear fuel cycle.

There is a need for the support of advanced converter reactor concepts. The development of such concepts is a logical step in the realization of "breeder" reactors, which is the ultimate objective of our long-term program. The development of "breeder" reactors will permit the addition of a virtually unlimited source of economic energy.

We should try to carry out this logical development with a minimum of direct Government construction. This can best be accomplished by entering into cooperative arrangements with manufacturers and utilities for the construction and operation of more advanced converter reactors. In this way, the goals of better fuel economy and more efficient utilization of our nuclear materials resources can be realized at a lower net cost to the Government.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my complete agreement with the remarks of the distinguished vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

He and I have been members of the joint committee since its inception. Over the past two decades, we have been able to witness the remarkable progress atomic energy has made, particularly in the field of civilian nuclear power. I believe we have realized some solid technical accomplishments of which we may all be proud.

For the past 10 years, I have served as chairman of the Joint Committee's Subcommittee on Research and Development. In addition, as many of you may know, I also serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of the House Armed Services Committee, and I am also a member of the recently created Select Committee on Government Research. And so, for the better part of 20 years, I have been closely associated with all phases of the Government's research and development program. I know of few fields of Government research which have been so successful with such a modest investment of the taxpayers' dollar. I know of few fields in which Government research can bring such solid tangible benefits to the American people. The research program in civilian nuclear power can provide the Nation with a new energy source—a source which is theoretically unlimited. It can be one of the truly worthwhile legacies that we can leave to future generations of Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the cooperative power reactor demonstration program provides a means for private industry to participate in this important development program. It allows us to brings to bear the inventiveness and creativity of private industry. It allows us to pursue the program of research and development at a fraction of the cost which would otherwise be required, for a totally Government-run program. In short, the cooperative power program makes good technical and economic sense.

I share the hope of the gentleman from California that a sensible compromise can be reached which will permit this vitally important program to continue.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]. I believe that the development of atomic power is vitally important to the future growth of the Nation, and it is my sincere hope that a compromise can be worked out which will assure the continuation of a strong research and development effort in the field of civilian nuclear power.

I also note, Mr. Chairman, that the committee, in considering the AEC appropriation, deleted $750,000 which had been programed for a community building at Los Alamos. In its report, the committee stated that it "would be glad to consider funding of such a building, but it is convinced that an adequate facility can be provided at a lower cost."

Mr. Chairman, this building was authorized as part of the legislation which was enacted last year for the sale of the Government-owned community at Los Alamos, N. Mex. Although it was the purpose of that legislation to remove the Government from the so-called "community business," it was, at the same time, the intent of Congress that a healthy and viable community be maintained for the citizens of Los Alamos who are contributing so much to our national defense and security.

The physical heart of an effective community government is its city hall, around which all civic activities are centered.

The community building program for Los Alamos would provide facilities for county management, police protection, courthouse space, and all of the essential elements of good local government. No adequate facilities exist now for these functions.

I think it should be noted that when we disposed of Richland, Wash., and Oak Ridge, Tenn.—the other two atomic energy communities—we provided a community building at a cost of $650,000, in the case of Richland, and $500,000, in the case of Oak Ridge. Los Alamos is a higher-cost construction area, and in addition, it requires facilities not only for municipal functions, but for county operations as well, because the city is the seat of the county.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Appropriations Committee did well to point out its concern over the cost of this building. I hope, however, that an agreement can be reached under which a sufficient sum can be provided in order to build an adequate community structure, taking into consideration the unusual construction problems in a remote area like Los Alamos.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries appropriations for the Narraguagus River in the Second Congressional District in Maine. This is a most constructive project long needed by the community. I appreciate the consideration of the committee.

The Portland Harbor project has an appropriation of $1 million for a 40-foot channel. The Corps of Engineers has found ample economic justification for the 45-foot channel and the Congress authorized the project on that basis. I believe it important to give further consideration of this 45-foot channel and appreciate this careful consideration by the committee.

Seaport Harbor is one of the vital seaports of our State. The fund of $718,000 included in this bill will provide for vital improvements.

May I express to the committee my appreciation of their careful study of the needs in Maine.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, the State of Rhode Island has a vital interest in six important projects which are included in the public works appropriation bill, 1964.

Three million dollars of Federal funds are earmarked to assist in the completion of the Fox Point hurricane barrier in Providence. This protective facility will be of great help in guarding the State's largest commercial area from the ravages of hurricane damage.

The Lower Woonsocket flood control project is allocated $1,450,000 in the measure now before us. As a citizen of that fine city, I am well aware of the serious danger which this project is intended to help correct. I strongly recommend your approval of the appropriation specified in the bill.

Other projects necessary to the welfare of my State are the Point Judith hurricane barrier for which $50,000 has been allocated; the Point Judith harbor and breakwater calling for $470,000; the Narragansett Pier hurricane barrier for which $50,000 is set aside; and the Pawtuxet Cove project for which the committee has recommended $230,000.

It is essential to the best interests of Rhode Island and the Nation that the projects I have mentioned be undertaken or continued without delay. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the allocation of the full amounts approved by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it is my considered opinion that the most important waterway project before the Congress of the United States is the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. My support of this project is primarily based upon its defense value. Four Presidents of the United States have had an important part to play in the recent history of this project: Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, and even way back in the 19th century President Andrew Jackson vigorously supported this canal. After extended studies through many years of other various possible alternative routes the present route was selected and the project was authorized in 1942 by a bill, "to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipeline and a navigable barge channel across Florida." This authorization by Congress was not on the basis of any economic justification but solely on its national defense values. The canal, however, was not built at that time because of the necessity in time of war to apply to all manpower and equipment in other directions in the emergencies involved.

As soon as I was discharged from the U.S. Army in 1947, I ran for Congress on the platform of the construction of this canal and came to Congress in January of 1949. I had the active help of President Truman in the accumulation of material necessary for a full presentation to Congress, but was not able to make such a presentation until during the administration of President Eisenhower. Under President Eisenhower's leadership it was thought that it would be well to see if the project could be justified not only for its defense values but also for its economic justifications, and President Eisenhower took the leadership in making this a budget item, and the studies were conducted and they showed economic justification for the project during the Eisenhower administration. Additional surveys were made in the beginning of President Kennedy's administration and they resulted in an even greater economic justification, 500 percent more than the original economic justification, or the final figure of 1.2 over 1.

During President Kennedy's campaign for the Presidency of the United States he had written me and allowed me to publish during that campaign the following statement over his signature:

I know of your persistent work for the early construction of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal. If I am elected President, I will be glad to cooperate with you in making this project a reality. I regard it not only as important to Florida, but to the economy of our entire country, which must fully utilize all of our natural resources if we are to achieve necessary economic expansion.

President Kennedy has vigorously presented this matter to Congress. He actively urged the favorable action of Congress last year in its approval of his budgeted item of $205,000 for final planning. He placed in his budget this year $1 million to begin construction of the canal and he has urged our approval of the item. The House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works have approved and I am deeply grateful for this wonderful support by the President and by the committee.

I would like to say something about the defense value of this project. On May 11, 1962, Chairman CARL VINSON of the Armed Services Committee wrote Chairman CLARENCE CANNON of the Appropriations Committee as follows:

I am very hopeful that during this Congress your committee will see fit to appropriate sufficient funds to make a forward step in the construction of the Cross Florida Barge Canal which is to be a section of the Intracoastal Waterway.

I am very much interested in this project because of its very important national defense aspects.

Chairman VINSON quoted the findings of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, August 30, 1946, in part, as follows:

The Chief of Engineers has stated in his opinion (hearing before the House Appropriations Subcommittee, January 9, 1946) that the authorized canal will represent, in addition to its economic worth, a value in national security considerably greater than its cost.

On May 29, 1951, the Deputy Secretary of Defense in a letter to the President, stated as follows:

The Corps of Engineers expressed the views that "a barge canal will afford a short, economical, protected route across Florida for the movement of a large amount of long-haul traffic by barge and small freighters between gulf and Atlantic ports. Large tonnages of raw materials as well as manufactured products are susceptible to movement between those points via protected inland waters at great saving. Completion of the canal would also permit quick, safe, and economical transfer between the east and west coasts of Florida, of floating plant and construction equipment now required to move via the circuitous and dangerous Florida Keys route.

"During World War II, many cargo ships and tankers were lost off the coast of Florida due to enemy action. Many of the cargoes that were lost would and could have moved by barge or small freighter had the barge canal been in existence at that time. The saving in lives, ships, and valuable and critical cargoes would have been great. Similar and comparable savings would also accrue in future serious national emergencies if the canal is in operation."

The Joint Chiefs of Staff find that either of these projects (i.e., the previously considered ship canal or the authorized barge canal) will provide an additional and shorter line of communication between the gulf coast, and the east coast, and would thus reduce exposure of shipping to submarine attack.

In the mentioned report of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors,

they said to the Chief of Army Engineers:

The economic analysis of a long-lived project could not be considered complete if it covered merely the interval of peacetime years and ignored the recurrent war periods. The insurance value of the avoidance of war losses is, therefore, distributable on an annual basis and can be at least roughly approximated in dollars and cents for measurement against the monetary annual charges of providing and maintaining the facilities.

The Board then goes on to compute the annual value of this wartime insurance afforded by the project as $3,600,000 based on price and replacement cost levels of 1946. In terms of today's price levels, this figure is above $10 million per year and more than doubles the total economic benefits currently reported by the Corps of Engineers in their interim report as to the peacetime economies to be yielded by the waterway.

The Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President, in the fall of last year, reviewed a memorandum on the national defense value of the project, prepared by H. H. Buckman, engineer, and said as follows about it:

We have reviewed the Buckman memorandum and appended papers and feel that its thesis is sound and its findings still essentially valid with respect to civil as well as military defense. The desirability of a shorter line of communications between the gulf and east coasts is recognized.

Engineer Buckman further points out the tremendous cost of lost shipping in World War II due to the necessity of using the gulf-Atlantic open sealanes, and said:

Over 1 million gross tons, or 25 percent of all the shipping in these lanes, was lost. The value was $987 million, and 167 ships went to the bottom.

From what I have pointed out to you the national defense value of this canal is outstanding and there should be no further delay in going forward with it.

The lone opposition to this canal has been from railroads, which have traditionally opposed canals all over the country. It should be pointed out, however, that the Florida East Coast Railroad supports the canal and that many individuals in the railroad industry favor the canal. General Morris of the U.S. Army Engineers this year in the House hearings said with regard to railroad interests as follows:

In a short time the canal will assume its proper place in the overall transportation network. Developments along and adjacent to the canal will be accelerated, particularly by industries utilizing and processing raw materials. When this condition develops it can be anticipated that the volume of traffic transported by rail and truck will also expand due to their natural advantages in the transportation of certain classes of commodities. While this trend can be anticipated from the statistical studies made for the economic restudy of the canal, it has been clearly shown in the growth pattern of transportation in other sections of the country under similar conditions. It is believed that the provision of cheap water transportation for bulky commodities to this section of the Southeastern States will create such developments that loss of traffic to competing rail and truck transportation systems will not be of lasting importance and the resulting improvement of regional economic conditions will ultimately add materially to their traffic.

Before closing this talk, I would like to say a few things about arguments which have been raised against the canal: One is that when the canal reaches the Gulf of Mexico it reaches open waters and the route it no longer well protected until it reaches the next dug canal to the north in the shoreline of Florida some miles away. This question is answered completely by the fact that barges now safely use this partially protected area of the Apalachee Bay just as they now use partially protected routes in the Chesapeake Bay and in the Mississippi Sound. The question was answered pointblank by the Chief of Engineers in his letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House under date of June 15, 1942, as follows:

With reference to the use by Intracoastal Waterway traffic of the open gulf between the eastern terminus of the present Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay and the gulf terminus of the above-mentioned barge canal, it may be stated that coastwise traffic now follows this route and that while some danger is connected therewith, I am informed that there is very little time lost in navigating this portion of the gulf. Accordingly, it would be possible to eliminate that section of the Intracoastal Waterway from the improvements proposed in H.R. 6999 and still move very large quantities of commerce by barge from terminals along the gulf coast to the eastern seaboard with the completion of the other improvements proposed in the bill.

Another argument that is made against this canal is that there is an existing canal running across the State of Florida in its southern portions, the Okeechobee Waterway. This southern route is 356 miles longer and is more expensive to construct and maintain even though it does exist in a very limited degree at the present time. Further, its utilization is much more limited than utilization of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal would be, according to authentic and careful studies that have been made over a period of many years. On this point there is a letter from the Office of Chief of Engineers dated May 17, 1962, which went into this question and stated as follows:

The existing Okeechobee Waterway provides a channel 8 feet deep and 80 feet wide from the Intracoastal Waterway near St. Lucie Inlet to the Gulf of Mexico near Fort Myers Beach. This waterway includes three locks, 50 feet wide and 250 feet long. In 1958, preliminary cost estimates were made for enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway to the same design criteria established for the Cross-Florida Barge Canal project. Those estimates showed that the cost of enlarging the Okeechobee Waterway would exceed $100 million. Traffic studies also showed that the volume of commerce that would use an enlarged Okeechobee Waterway, and the transportation savings therefrom, would be far from sufficient to justify the large cost of improvement of the existing waterway to the dimensions of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal.

Finally, it is said by the railroad lobby that the economic justification of the Cross-Florida Barge Canal is slight and that the benefits are primarily to Florida rather than to the Nation as a whole. As to the economic justification, I would like to point out that even on the most conservative figure presented by the Corps of Engineers, 1.2 over 1, this is an economic justification in excess of other projects which Congress has authorized, projects involving more money than this project, and we are spending money for such other developments right now in actual construction. As to the argument of the locality of the project, this is perhaps the most absurd argument which is raised against the Cross-Florida Barge Canal because it actually has more national significance than any waterway project ever undertaken by the U.S. Government. An accurate reading of the information given to the committee shows that although about 80 percent of the traffic would either start or stop in Florida, only 16 percent of it would be of the within-the-State variety even when most conservative analysis is used as to its interstate utilization.

This compares very favorably with other projects. Moreover, it should finally be observed that this project was not authorized by Congress on the basis of economic justification, but was authorized on the basis of its defense value and that the defense value is certainly the paramount value of this project. Even if all of the economic justification of this project were thrown out the window, the project still should be built because of its defense values of which I have already spoken.

In conclusion I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the House Appropriations Committee and its Subcommittee on Public Works and to the President and to the leadership on each side of the aisle in Congress for support of this project. I sincerely hope that this $1 million in construction funds will be promptly approved.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure today to commend the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the excellent job he and the members of the committee have done on the bill appropriating funds for our public works projects.

The people of the Fourth District of Florida are indeed grateful for the favorable consideration given to the sorely needed works in Dade County, Fla. They are particularly grateful that the ranking majority member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and the hard-working members of the committee recognized the need for the beginning of construction on canal C–111—which is part of the south Dade plan—and Cutler drain. The earmarking of up to $200,000 and $300,000 respectively for these projects, which are an integral part of the central and southern Florida flood control district, is the answer to hundreds of urgent pleas from officials and residents of Dade County.

The area encompassed by the south Dade plan comprises about 227 square miles of agricultural and urban subarea and contains most of the local vegetable farms and groves which make up the nontourist factor of our economy. The area is bounded on two sides by existing flood control works, but expanded urbanization and increased industrializa-

tion have rapidly forced farmers onto lands that presently have little or no flood control protection.

Subsequent to the submission of the budget for fiscal year 1964, Aerojet General Corp., which acquired about 74,000 acres of land in the south Dade area and is now finishing work on their new plant, contracted for the development and testing of solid fuel rocket engines for the Air Force. One of the primary considerations in the selection of this site was its location with respect to the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway as a barge transportation route to the Cape Canaveral area.

An early start on construction of canal C–111, as part of the South Dade flood control plan authorized by Congress last year, will serve the dual purpose of flood control and barge transportation for the completed solid-fuel rocket engines to the Intracoastal Waterway and thence to the launch site at Canaveral.

The population of the Cutler drain area, which comprises 38.4 square miles, has increased from 945 in 1950 to 27,300 in 1960 and is still growing rapidly. The area is subject to serious flood hazard due to the fact that local secondary drainage works are ineffective without an adequate primary channel to carry off the floodwaters.

Damaging floods have been experienced in 1947, 1948, 1949, 1952, 1953, 1954, 1958, and twice in 1960. Hurricane Donna, which poured 15 inches of rainfall from September 9 through 11, 1960, and hurricane Florence, which dropped 12 inches of rainfall from September 21 through 25, 1960, left the major portion of the area inundated from 2 to 40 days.

Dade County, because of this constant threat, has added $67,000 to next year's budget for secondary channels in this area; 13.6 miles of primary outlet channels have already been constructed. During the floods of 1960 over 13,000 acres or about 55 percent of the area, were under water. Where there to be a recurrence of this catastrophe, it is estimated that damages would exceed $480,200; average annual flood damages are estimated at $101,600.

The residents and property owners of the Cutler drain area can thank the chairman and members of the Appropriations Committee for lifting this ever-present threat to their lives and property.

In addition to the previously mentioned two projects for which funds were earmarked out of the $14 million approved for the central and southern Florida flood control district, I am pleased to say that the committee provided the full budget request on other projects vitally affecting Dade County.

The committee allocated $1,500,000 for fiscal year 1964 for the continuation of the necessary dredging operations to widen the ship channel in Miami Harbor from 300 to 400 feet. Dade County and the city of Miami are now constructing a causeway, access bridge, and related port facilities at an estimated cost of $9 million in addition to the required non-Federal contribution of $1,826,000. The port of Miami is the second largest cruise passenger port in the United States and cargo tonnage passing over the facilities has increased approximately 75 percent since October 1957.

Included in the bill is $2,085,000 for widening and deepening the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway from Fort Lauderdale to Miami. The existing channel is 8 by 100 feet and these funds will enable construction to the dimension of 10 by 125 feet during fiscal year 1964.

Also included is $75,000 for initiation of a general investigation study of the Everglades National Park. Department of Interior representatives have concluded that the park is not receiving sufficient fresh water inflow during dry weather conditions to support the normal biological conditions within the park. This investigation will determine actual waterflow conditions and the best way of correcting the situation. The study is expected to take about 3 years at a total cost of $400,000.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to have this opportunity to convey to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and my colleagues who serve on this important committee, my sincere thanks and appreciation for their consideration and cooperation in approving these badly needed funds for Florida's Fourth District projects.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my deep appreciation to the members of the House Committee on Appropriations for including in the public works appropriation bill on the floor today, $1,500,000 to permit continued construction of our Yaquina Bay and Harbor project in Oregon and also for approving $1,100,000 to continue major rehabilitation work on the north jetty, Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg. The committee is indeed to be commended for approving these funds for these most meritorious and important projects.

The Yaquina project, costing $24,400,000 when completed, is of paramount importance to the economy and employment of Lincoln County and, indeed, will benefit all of Oregon. When completed, it will make Yaquina Bay and Harbor a top ranked Oregon port. At the present time, shipment of timber products from Yaquina Bay is very seriously hampered by channel depths. Only partial loadings are now possible and delays in shipments often result. The improvements under this project will remedy this serious handicap to navigation and make Yaquina a year-round harbor and result in large savings in transportation costs and elimination of delays. This will, of course, tremendously assist the lumber industry and open up entirely new phases of commerce from expansion of exports and imports. Commercial fishing and recreation will also be greatly benefited as well as the lumber industry.

Completion of the $2,140,000 rehabilitation project on the north jetty of Tillamook Bay and Bar will also give a tremendous boost to the economy and the employment opportunities of our Tillamook area. Improvement to the north jetty will permit barging of timber products and will also be of great value to commercial fishermen and pleasure craft. The rebuilt jetty will provide a more protected and safer bay entrance and make possible a greater use of the navigation project in the bay.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity to express my personal thanks as well as the thanks of his honor, the mayor of the city of New York, Hon. Robert F. Wagner, and of all the people of the city of New York to the members of this committee for their having included in the pending bill an appropriation in the amount of $95,000 for a study by the Corps of Army Engineers on the dangers to navigation which exist in New York Harbor due to floating debris emanating from old and unused piers and sunken and abandoned hulks and derelicts.

This study has been estimated to take approximately 1 year to complete and will include a thorough survey of the New York-New Jersey Harbor and its tributary waters for sources of debris. The study will make it possible for the Corps of Army Engineers to make a determination on the procedures necessary to carry out a project including such matters as temporary waivers of proprietary interest in or the institution of proceedings to have such hulks or derelict structures declared a menace to navigation. This project is vital to the safety of navigation in New York Harbor and the protection of both commercial and pleasure craft.

Our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] who represents the entire Staten Island waterfront area, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] and all those Members of this House who interested themselves in this worthwhile project are likewise entitled to commendation.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the Mississippi River forms the western boundary of the congressional district I represent, and the Illinois River courses through the district's center.

Through the years the Federal Government has carried out navigation policies on these rivers which, in turn, have increased flood hazards to adjacent farmland.

It is, therefore, a proper responsibility of the Federal Government to help levee and drainage districts meet this hazard with flood control structures.

In this bill are six flood control projects within the 20th District: Planning money, Indian Grave drainage district, $100,000; McGee Creek drainage and levee district, $80,000; Sny Island levee drainage district, $166,000; Clear Lake special drainage district, $51,000; Sid Simpson flood control project at Beardstown, $695,000; the Sny Basin project, $3,500,000.

Each project has been thoroughly studied by local interests and by the Corps of Engineers. Each comes to the House with the recommendation of local interests and the corps.

I am honored to have this opportunity to urge approval of these needed improvements, and to express my appreciation to the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] for their splendid cooperation.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] in his expression of appreciation of the cooperation of the members of the committee. I especially want to express appreciation of the invaluable service rendered by the gentleman from Iowa, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, in the long hearings and the preparation of this very intricate and difficult bill.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is one of the most valuable members of the committee and of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $180,190,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I note there are some $49 or $50 million for the Department of the Interior in this bill. I also note a news story datelined Minneapolis, Minn., November 16, 1963, in which a Dr. Athelstan Spilhaus, dean of the University of Minnesota Institute of Technology, has been delegated to plan the new $10 million fish pond in Washington, otherwise known as an aquarium.

Among other things, according to the news story, Dr. Spilhaus says there is to be a pond with dead fish to show how a polluted stream harms wild life. He also apparently is going to provide a seafood restaurant, the menu of which would include such marine rarities as "Japanese hamburger." A "Japanese hamburger" is described as consisting of raw fish and seaweed.

I hope this restaurant is located at some little distance from the stream that is going to be filled with dead fish because I cannot believe "Japanese hamburger" is going to be appetizing even without the dead fish close by.

My question to somebody on the committee is whether there is any money in the Interior Department's $50 million for the fish pond that is to be located on the Potomac River? Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any money for the Japanese delicatessen in this bill?

Mr. KIRWAN. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill for the fish pond to be erected on the Potomac River?

Mr. KIRWAN. When the appropriations for the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium was in here recently the gentleman said he stayed up until 2 o'clock in the morning to study the bill. If he stayed up until 2 o'clock studying this bill I am sure he knows there is nothing in this bill concerning the item.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman give me credit for staying up until 2 o'clock and trying?

Mr. KIRWAN. There is not a dime in this bill for that.

Mr. GROSS. That is all I wanted to hear, and I thank the gentleman for the information.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. ALBERT] having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 27, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 207]

YEAS—358

Abernethy	Baldwin	Boland
Adair	Baring	Bolling
Addabbo	Barrett	Bolton, Frances P.
Albert	Barry	Bolton, Oliver P.
Anderson	Bass	Bonner
Andrews, Ala.	Bates	Bow
Andrews, N. Dak.	Battin	Brademas
Arends	Beckworth	Bray
Ashbrook	Beermann	Brock
Ashley	Belcher	Brooks
Ashmore	Bell	Broomfield
Aspinall	Bennett, Fla.	Brown, Calif.
Auchincloss	Berry	Brown, Ohio
Ayres	Betts	Broyhill, N.C.
Baker	Blatnik	Burke
	Boggs	Burkhalter
		Burleson
		Byrne, Pa.
		Byrnes, Wis.
		Cahill
		Cameron
		Cannon
		Casey
		Cederberg
		Chamberlain
		Chelf
		Chenoweth
		Clark
		Clausen, Don H.
		Cleveland
		Cohelan
		Colmer
		Conte
		Cooley
		Corbett
		Corman
		Cramer
		Cunningham
		Curtin
		Curtis
		Daddario
		Daniels
		Davis, Ga.
		Davis, Tenn.
		Dawson
		Delaney
		Dent
		Denton
		Derounian
		Diggs
		Dingell
		Dole
		Donohue
		Dorn
		Dowdy
		Downing
		Dulski
		Dwyer
		Edmondson
		Edwards
		Elliott
		Ellsworth
		Everett
		Evins
		Fallon
		Farbstein
		Fascell
		Feighan
		Findley
		Finnegan
		Fino
		Fisher
		Flood
		Flynt
		Fogarty
		Ford
		Forrester
		Fountain
		Fraser
		Frelinghuysen
		Friedel
		Fulton, Pa.
		Fulton, Tenn.
		Fuqua
		Gallagher
		Garmatz
		Gary
		Gathings
		Giaimo
		Gibbons
		Gilbert
		Glenn
		Gonzalez
		Grabowski
		Grant
		Gray
		Green, Oreg.
		Green, Pa.
		Griffin
		Griffiths
		Grover
		Gubser
		Gurney
		Hagan, Ga.
		Hagen, Calif.
		Haley
		Hall
		Halpern
		Hanna
		Hansen
		Hardy
		Harris
		Harrison
		Harsha
		Harvey, Mich.
		Hawkins
		Hays
		Healey
		Hechler
		Henderson
		Herlong
		Hoeven
		Holifield
		Holland
		Horan
		Horton
		Huddleston
		Hull
		Ichord
		Jarman
		Jensen
		Johnson, Calif.
		Johnson, Wis.
		Jonas
		Jones, Ala.
		Jones, Mo.
		Karsten
		Karth
		Kee
		Keith
		Keogh
		Kilburn
		Kilgore
		King, Calif.
		Kirwan
		Kluczynski
		Kornegay
		Kunkel
		Kyl
		Landrum
		Langen
		Lankford
		Leggett
		Lennon
		Lesinski
		Libonati
		Lindsay
		Lipscomb
		Long, Md.
		McClory
		McCulloch
		McDade
		McDowell
		McFall
		McIntire
		McLoskey
		McMillan
		Macdonald
		Madden
		Mahon
		Martin, Nebr.
		Mathias
		Matsunaga
		Matthews
		May
		Miller, Calif.
		Miller, N.Y.
		Mills
		Minish
		Minshall
		Monagan
		Montoya
		Moore
		Moorhead
		Morgan
		Morris
		Morrison
		Morse
		Morton
		Mosher
		Moss
		Murphy, Ill.
		Murphy, N.Y.
		Murray
		Natcher
		Nedzi
		Nelsen
		Nix
		Norblad
		O'Brien, N.Y.
		O'Hara, Ill.
		O'Hara, Mich.
		O'Konski
		Olsen, Mont.
		Olson, Minn.
		O'Neill
		Osmers
		Ostertag
		Passman
		Patman
		Patten
		Pelly
		Pepper
		Perkins
		Philbin
		Pike
		Pillion
		Pirnie
		Poage
		Pool
		Powell
		Price
		Pucinski
		Purcell
		Quie
		Quillen
		Rains
		Reid, N.Y.
		Reifel
		Reuss
		Rhodes, Ariz.
		Rhodes, Pa.
		Rich
		Riehlman
		Rivers, Alaska
		Rivers, S.C.
		Roberts, Ala.
		Roberts, Tex.
		Robison
		Rogers, Colo.
		Rogers, Fla.
		Rogers, Tex.
		Rooney, Pa.
		Rooney, N.Y.
		Roosevelt
		Rosenthal
		Rostenkowski
		Roudebush
		Roush
		Roybal
		Ryan, Mich.
		Ryan, N.Y.
		St Germain
		Schadeberg
		Schenck
		Schneebeli
		Schweiker
		Scott
		Secrest
		Selden
		Senner
		Sheppard
		Short
		Sibal
		Sickles
		Sikes
		Siler
		Sisk
		Skubitz
		Slack
		Smith, Iowa
		Smith, Va.
		Springer
		Staebler
		Stafford
		Staggers
		Steed
		Stephens
		Stratton
		Stubblefield
		Sullivan
		Taft
		Talcott
		Taylor
		Teague, Calif
		Teague, Tex.
		Thomas
		Thompson, La.
		Thompson, N.J.
		Thompson, Tex.
		Thomson, Wis.
		Thornberry
		Toll
		Tollefson
		Tupper
		Tuten
		Udall
		Ullman
		Utt
		Van Deerlin
		Vanik
		Van Pelt
		Vinson
		Waggonner
		Wallhauser
		Watson
		Watts
		Weaver
		Weltner
		Westland
		Whalley
		Wharton
		White
		Whitener
		Whitten
		Wickersham
		Widnall
		Williams
		Willis
		Wilson, Charles H.
		Wilson, Ind.
		Winstead
		Wright
		Wyman
		Young
		Younger
		Zablocki

NAYS—27

Alger	Hutchinson	Poff
Becker	Joelson	Rumsfeld
Bruce	Johansen	St. George
Clancy	King, N.Y.	Saylor
Collier	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Devine	Latta	Snyder
Goodell	MacGregor	Stinson
Gross	Marsh	Tuck
Hoffman	Michel	Wydler

NOT VOTING—48

Abbitt	Gill	Martin, Mass.
Abele	Goodling	Meader
Avery	Halleck	Milliken
Bennett, Mich.	Harding	Multer
Bromwell	Harvey, Ind.	O'Brien, Ill.
Brotzman	Hébert	Pilcher
Broyhill, Va.	Hemphill	Randall
Buckley	Hosmer	Reid, Ill.
Burton	Jennings	Rodino
Carey	Kastenmeier	St. Onge
Celler	Kelly	Schwengel
Clawson, Del	Knox	Shelley
Dague	Lloyd	Shipley
Derwinski	Long, La.	Shriver
Duncan	Mailliard	Trimble
Foreman	Martin, Calif.	Wilson, Bob

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Milliken for, with Mr. Derwinski against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hébert with Bob Wilson.
Mr. Shelley with Del Clawson.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Goodling.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Burton.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Brotzman.
Mr. Gill with Mr. Lloyd.
Mr. Harding with Mr. Abele.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Martin of California.
Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Avery.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Jennings with Mrs. Reid of Illinois.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Foreman.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Long of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Schriver.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Dague.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and Messrs. COLLIER and JOELSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay".

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 202 I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "aye." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for November 18, 1963, be corrected in that rollcall No. 205 be corrected to show that the pairs are general pairs instead of live pairs, as they are now listed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the public works appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARTIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during the vote on the public works appropriation bill. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

NO NEW CIVIL RIGHTS LAW NEEDED

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, there is obtainable from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, a document entitled "Provisions of the Constitution, Statutes, and Executive Orders and Regulations of the United States Relating to the Infringement of Civil Rights on the Basis of Race, Religion, Color, or National Origin."

I particularly want to invite the attention of my colleagues to this publication because I hopefuly believe that upon reviewing it they will conclude that no additional civil rights legislation is needed.

This document contains some 190 pages of excerpts and references. While I cannot personally vouch for everything it contains, and some of the items do seem rather farfetched in their application to the subject, it is on the whole a commendable job of research.

Here we find a description of the Civil Rights Commission. The various parts of the Constitution that are considered applicable are quoted. The table of contents lists general civil rights statutes, jurisdiction of district courts, statutory provisions having to do with elections, housing, education, employment, transportation, jury rights, and much more, right on down through the use of the Armed Forces to enforce Federal authority.

This interesting document illustrates an important point that ought to be given full consideration in connection with any new civil rights proposals, that is, there is a vast amount of such legislation on the statute books already. It shows that our legal establishment has available sufficient authority to guarantee the civil rights of all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, in view of this super abundance of so-called civil rights legislation, and especially in view of the nature of current proposals, any new such legislation likely to be adopted will have a whiplash effect on the American people, including the very people who now advocate the legislation and those they seek to mollify.

Under the guise of civil rights the executive branch of our Government is seeking power that would enable it to control our homes, businesses, farms, banks, schools, and the election machinery.

Under the guise of civil rights the Executive asks authority to tell you—if you own a business—whom you shall hire, fire, promote, or demote.

Under the guise of civil rights the President seeks power to blacklist individuals and business firms from Federal programs, activities, subsidies, and benefits.

The whiplash, or backlash, if current civil rights proposals are enacted, will be the regimentation of our citizens in ways, and in areas of private endeavor, hitherto undreamed of since first we freed ourselves from the British Crown.

Our Founding Fathers purposely and painfully drafted and ratified a written Constitution primarily to put the Government they were establishing beyond the control of impatient public officials, temporary majorities, and the vacillating moods of public opinion. The current drive for civil rights legislation is spearheaded by impatient public officials under pressure from voting blocs of citizens who, while nowise a majority, hold the balance of electoral power in certain political strongholds, namely the big cities of the North and East.

The whiplash of new civil rights laws would immediately affect and harm upward to 90 percent of our population, but in time its sting would be felt by the other 10 percent as well. The cause of freedom would suffer for all people, for all time, everywhere in this great land of ours.

Clearly, no additional civil rights legislation is advisable, and with such an abundance of such already within our statutes, covering every imaginable subject, certainly none is needed.

ANY AMERICAN WOULD DO THE SAME

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as my name has been used on a personal basis recently, I am submitting the following:

[From the Valley News, El Cajon, Calif., Nov. 1, 1963]

ANY AMERICAN WOULD DO THE SAME

Two Texas Congressmen got into a fight this week.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Nov. 21, 1963
For actions of Nov. 20, 1963
88th-1st; No. 188

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,12,15
Area redevelopment.....22
Balance of Payments.....3
Budget.....24
Civil rights.....19
Commission.....34,46
Commodity exchange.....38
Conservation.....25
Consumers.....18
Debt limit.....6
Depressed areas.....14
Economics.....46
Employment.....28
Family farm.....26
Farm information.....17
Farm loans.....42
Farm program.....39
Feed.....41
Fisheries.....32
Food.....7,18,34
Food and fiber.....34
Foreign aid.....9,16
Foreign currencies.....15
Foreign trade.....5,44
Forest lands.....40
Information.....17,18
Inspection services.....35
Lands.....20
Legislative process.....29
Legislative program.....11
Lumber.....23
Manpower.....33
Marketing.....43
Meat imports.....36
Monopolies.....45
Prices.....10,30
Public works.....15
Reclamation.....21
Recreation.....4
Rice acreage.....13
Roads.....27
Soil bank.....37
Soviet agriculture.....31
Tobacco.....8
United Nations.....2

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill. Sen. Humphrey spoke on "Food is power." Sen. McGovern inserted and commended "Agricultural Notes" issue on food. Sen. Church commended Sen. Neuberger's new book on tobacco smoking. Sen. Scott inserted articles favoring "quality stabilization" bill. Sen. Mundt inserted his testimony on his wheat-to-Russia bill. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed bill to establish Commission to make detailed study of food and fiber needs. Rep. McIntire introduced and discussed bill to authorize Farmers Home Administration to make economic disaster loans. Rep. Nelsen inserted article commenting on report favoring abolition of family farms. Rep. Nelsen inserted Sen. Goldwater's article criticizing "collapse of American intelligence about Soviet agriculture."

SENATE

1. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL. Passed, 72-1, with amendments this bill, H.R. 8747. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 21324, 21328-44, 21346-82

2. UNITED NATIONS. Received the President's report on U. S. participation in the U.N. during 1962. pp. 21321-2

3. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS. Sen. Symington discussed "the causes of balance-of-payments deficits." pp. 21322-4

4. RECREATION. Sen. Moss recommended protection of wildlife and beauty and inserted an article by Harold S. Crane, Utah Department of Fish and Game, "State's Views on Federal Recreation Programs." pp. 21326-8

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Mundt inserted his testimony on his bill, S. 2310, relating to sale of grain to Communist nations. pp. 21400-5
Sen. Fulbright commented that the Senate may vote not to sell wheat to Russia and that we may have to let the weevils eat it. p. 21359

6. DEBT LIMIT. The Finance Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8969, to provide for a temporary further increase in the public debt limit (S. Rept. 646). p. 21383

7. FOOD. Sen. Humphrey spoke on "Food Is Power," discussing the farmer's contribution to American strength, the need for food reserves, agriculture and the balance of payments, food for peace, food and population, North America and food supplies, food production and weather, and a bipartisan commission on future food reserves. pp. 21384-7
Sen. McGovern inserted and commended the FES "Agricultural Notes" by Phillip F. Aylesworth discussing the food-for-peace related programs. pp. 21395-6

8. TOBACCO. Sen. Church commended Sen. Neuberger's new book, "Smoke Screen: Tobacco and the Public Welfare." pp. 21389-92

9. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Church objected to aid to "nations which no longer need it" and inserted an editorial, "The Free Ride Can't Go on Forever." p. 21392
Sen. Kuchel commended the amendment for establishment of an Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid. pp. 21394-5

10. PRICES. Sen. Scott inserted and commended a series of articles favoring the "quality stabilization" bill. pp. 21396-8

11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield said it is planned to take up the debt limit bill today and the library services bill tomorrow. p. 21363

HOUSE

12. APPROPRIATIONS. Agreed to Rep. Cannon's request that it be in order on Mon., Nov. 25, for the House to consider a continuing resolution for Dec. p. 21412

13. RICE ACREAGE. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 3742, relating to the transfer of rice acreage allotments. p. 21458

14. DEPRESSED AREAS. Rep. Michel criticized the preference accorded for defense contracts to depressed areas saying this forces the closing of plants in other areas. p. 21411

15. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL. As passed by the House (see Digest 187), this bill, H R. 9140, includes a general provision, in the language recommended by the President, as follows:
"Sec. 408. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts."

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

NOVEMBER 20 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1963

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money

in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Cemeterial Expenses

salaries and expenses

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; $10,800,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of $17,000, but such limitation may be

increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

Corps of Engineers—Civil

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, $18,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $210,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with

other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); $798,282,700, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further,* That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be co-

ordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; and emergency flood control and shore protection activities; $150,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of

Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Beach Erosion Board; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; $15,000,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), $74,500,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manners authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and eighty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

operating expenses

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; and payments of not to exceed $50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, $25,000,000.

capital outlay

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles for

replacement only, of which seven are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; $6,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters for non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding $16,500.

Panama Canal Company

CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

No real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

Not to exceed $9,000,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one limousine at not to exceed $6,300 and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding $30,000: *Provided,* That the rates for individuals shall not exceed $100 per diem.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof

or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, including not to exceed $400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to remain available until expended, $9,894,000, of which $8,621,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided,* That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further,* That $340,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $180,190,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant

to law, $38,000,000, of which $31,408,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $1,645,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided,* That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, $12,217,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in

section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, $97,845,700, of which $94,036,700 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and $3,809,000 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, $10,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided,* That no part

of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the

Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461–467) : *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations".

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those

functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular

benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed $225,000 may be expended from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

The amount of $241,160 shall be available from "Refunds and returns" for transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the amount of credits accumulated as a reserve for depreciation and/or replace-

ment of Siphon Drop powerplant, Yuma project, Arizona-California; this sum to be transferred to the Yuma County Water Users Association only after a contract providing for the custody, use, or expenditure of said money and containing terms satisfactory to the Secretary has been entered into with said association.

Bonneville Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law. $36,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $13,200,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for

construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $1,000,000.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not

to exceed four passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, $1,500,000.

CONTINUING FUND

Not to exceed $4,500,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy, and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available

for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000) ; reimbursement of

the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; $2,308,169,000, and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation

of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase (not to exceed four hundred and twenty-three for replacement only, including two at not to exceed $3,000 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $380,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1963, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for "Operating expenses", for capital equipment not related to construction, shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1963, of the appropriation "Plant acquisition and construction" shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $30,000,000 for a spectral shift power reactor may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the

Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to carry out such cooperative power reactor demonstration program as may be authorized by law.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1964 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropirations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the fiscal year 1964 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is

a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government

Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed $429,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed $2,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day: *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for services of individuals employed at rates in excess of $50 per day.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including purchase (one for replacement only) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed one hundred and ninety for replace-

ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $46,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), $38,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $117,000.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. 401. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $1,950.

SEC. 402. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United

States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided,* That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the

Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

SEC. 403. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. 405. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the

current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of $6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

SEC. 406. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,* That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. 407. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made

to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury.

SEC. 408. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

SEC. 409. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964".

Passed the House of Representatives November 19, 1963.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

NOVEMBER 20 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1963
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

Dec. 4, 1963

SENATE

7. FARM LABOR. By a vote of 50 to 36, agreed to a motion by Sen. Ellender to concur in the House amendment to S. 1703, extending the Mexican farm labor program for one year without change. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 22103-9

8. WATER RESOURCES. Passed with amendments S. 1111, the proposed Water Resources Planning Act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning (pp. 22119-36). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Allott to provide that river basin commissions authorized by the bill shall be for areas (rather than regions)(p. 22129). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Allott to provide that river basin commissions shall terminate upon the agreement of not less than one-half of a majority of the States commission (p. 22129). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Allott authorizing appropriations of not to exceed $7,500,000 for the next three fiscal years (p. 22130). Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Allott to provide that subbasins shall be treated as separate basins (p. 22130).

9. GUAM. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 692, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain an agricultural program in Guam as determined by him will promote the welfare of the island (S. Rept. 678). p. 22076

10. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2218, to authorize the transfer of certain national forest lands in Cocke County, Tenn., to Interior for purposes of the Foothills Parkway (S. Rept. 679). p. 22076

11. PUERTO RICO. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5945, to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico (S. Rept. 681) p. 22076

12. NATIONAL FARMERS WEEK. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 128, to provide for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week (S. Rept. 683). p. 22076

13. COPYRIGHTS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. 776, to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors for a limited time against unauthorized copying (S. Rept. 686). p. 22077

14. APPROPRIATIONS. The "Daily Digest" states that a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee approved for full committee consideration the civil functions section of H. R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill for 1964, and that the full committee will consider this bill and H. R. 7063, the State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill, on Thurs. p. D954

15. COTTON. Sen. Humphrey expressed his opposition to the cotton bill as passed by the House and urged favorable consideration of the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill. Also, he stated that it "is time for us to take a good look at all of

of this agricultural legislation," and that he would "submit to the Senate a proposal for a blue ribbon commission to examine the entire agricultural policy of the United States." pp. 22150-3

16. WATERSHEDS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following watershed projects: Dry Creek and Fishing Creek, Ga.; Little Cache Creek, Ill.; Bachelor Run, Ind.; Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans.; Clam River, Mass.; Crane Creek, Minn.; Briar Creek, Pa.; and Glen Hills, Wis. p. D954

17. HAWAII. Passed without amendment S. 2275, to revise the procedures established by the Hawaii Statehood Act for the conveyance of certain lands to Hawaii. pp. 22091-2

18. PERSONNEL. Sen. Yarborough announced that hearings would be held Nov. 12 on proposed legislation to consolidate the civil service laws relating to the employment of civilians in more than one position. p. 22082

19. SCIENCE. Sen. Keating inserted an address by David Sarnoff, "The Impact of Science Upon Society." pp. 22087-9

20. EDUCATION. Sen. Pearson expressed concern over the effects of the delay in passage of legislation to extend Federal aid to schools in federally impacted areas. pp. 22089-90

21. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Douglas stated that "substantial disparities exist between outbound and inbound ocean freight rates" which tend "to act as a barrie to American exports," and inserted several items discussing the situation. pp. 22116-9

22. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Miller inserted an editorial commending the work of Self Help, Inc., a private organization, in providing aid, including agricultural equipment, to friendly nations. pp. 22137-8

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

23. BUDGET. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jensen stating that he "will work constantly and I hope effectively for a balanced budget for fiscal year 1965 and for every year thereafter." p. A7391

Extension of remarks of Rep. Derwinski stating that "there are immediate practical doubts that the public raises "concerning the announced policy of control of Federal spending. p. A7392

24. WATER POLLUTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. O'Hara inserting Rep. Monagan's speech on the problems of water pollution control and abatement. pp. A7400-1

25. TAXATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Jennings inserting the full text of an opinion poll which indicates the public favors the proposed tax cut bill. p. A7403

BILLS INTRODUCED

26. WHEAT. S. 2357 by Sen. Young, and H. R. 9344, by Rep. Andrews, N.D., to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of Sen. Young, pp. 22077-80

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bills on water resources, merchant marine, and Hawaii, and cleared for President the Mexican farm labor bill.

House passed the cotton bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 22075–22103

Bills Introduced: Five bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2357–2361; and S. Res. 230.

Page 22077

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 949, to revise the procedure for appointing U.S. Representatives to the U.N., with amendment (S. Rept. 676);

S. 2213, to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency, with amendment (S. Rept. 677);

S. 692, authorizing establishment of a Federal agriculture program for Guam (S. Rept. 678);

S. 2218, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to accept transfer of certain Tennessee forest lands for purposes of the Foothills Parkway (S. Rept. 679);

S. 1757, ratifying certain conveyances of land on the Crow Indian Reservation (S. Rept. 680);

H.R. 5945, to provide for the establishment of a U.S.-Puerto Rico Compact Commission, with amendments (S. Rept. 681);

S.J. Res. 113, authorizing President to designate the first week in March as Save Your Vision Week (S. Rept. 682);

S.J. Res. 128, providing for the establishment of an annual National Farmers Week (S. Rept. 683);

S. 1319, to make it a Federal crime for a juvenile delinquent to escape or to assist in escape from the custody of the Attorney General (S. Rept. 684);

H.R. 4766, a private bill (S. Rept. 685);

S. 776, proposed Design Protection Act (S. Rept. 686);

S. 579 and S. 2242, private bills (S. Repts. 687 and 688);

S. 2040, to modify the oath requirements relative to applicants for patents by permitting either oaths or declaration (S. Rept. 689);

H.R. 5703, a private bill (S. Rept. 690);

S. 1832, granting consent of Congress to supplemental compact between Pennsylvania and New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Port Authority (S. Rept. 691);

H.R. 1213, S. 1332, 1410, 1549, 1760, 1781, 1822, 1829, 1943, 1976, 2085, H.R. 1221, 1271, 1273, 1414, 1432, 1475, 1495, 1542, 1545, 1566, 2305, 2944, 3366, 3662, 3908, 4141, 4288, 4507, 4760, 4862, 5083, 5289, 5453, 5495, 5753, 5902, 6038, 6316, 6624, 6808, 7268, 7601, S. 633, 1518, 1951, 1958, H.R. 1395, S. 2084, and H.R. 1289, private bills (S. Repts. 692–741);

S. 1169, authorizing per capita distribution of $350 from funds arising from judgments in favor of the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, with amendments (S. Rept. 742); and

H.R. 4157, to revise, codify, and enact into law Part II of the D.C. Code entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," with amendments (S. Rept. 743).

Pages 22076–22077

President's Communication—Corps of Engineers: Communication from President transmitting amendments to the budget for fiscal year 1964 in the amount of $210,000 for the Corps of Engineers—Civil, Department of the Army, was received, referred to Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 45.

Page 22076

Appointment to Commissions: President pro tempore reappointed Senator Saltonstall as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission.

Senator Long of Missouri was appointed to be a member of the Commission on the Disposition of Alcatraz Island.

Page 22076

Agriculture—Mexican Farm Labor: By 50 yeas to 36 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate adopted Ellender motion to concur in House amendment to S. 1703, to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to extend for 1 year the Mexican farm labor program. The House amendment confines the legislation to a simple 1-year extension of the program.

This action cleared the bill for the President's signature.

Pages 22103–22109

Public Lands—Hawaii: Senate passed without amendment S. 2275, authorizing the return of ceded lands to Hawaii when no longer used by the Federal Government.

Pages 22091–22092

Water Resources: S. 1111, to establish a Water Resources Council to assist in the development of comprehensive water resources planning, was passed after adoption of the following amendments:

All committee amendments en bloc, which were then considered as original text for purpose of amendment; a series of Allott amendments (1) to provide that the river basin commissions authorized by the bill shall be for areas or river basins rather than regions or river basins, (2) providing that when within a reasonable time sufficient concurrences are not obtained to effectuate a request of the Council that a commission be established, the Council may upon a finding of need recommend to the President that such planning as is otherwise authorized by law proceed, (3) to establish limitation on authorized appropriations for each of the next 3 fiscal years of $7.5 million, (4) to limit Federal share of carrying out approved program in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands to 50 percent rather than 66 percent, and (5) numerous amendments of a technical perfecting nature. Pages 22119–22136

Merchant Marine: Senate passed by division vote (motion to reconsider tabled) H.R. 82, to amend the Merchant Marine Act so as to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses, after adopting Williams (Delaware) amendment barring payment of interest on any refund authorized under the legislation, and Lausche amendment respecting modification of contracts entered into pursuant to the legislation. Pages 22139–22146

Merchant Marine: Senate took up S. 927, to amend the Merchant Marine Act so as to remove certain limitations concerning war risk insurance, agreeing by unanimous consent that after 12:30 p.m. Thursday, December 5, debate on the bill will be limited to 2 hours, equally divided, with vote thereon to be taken at 2:30 p.m. Pages 22146–22151

Confirmations: 35 Public Health Service nominations were confirmed. Page 22157

Record Vote: One record vote was taken today. Page 22109

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:27 p.m. until noon Thursday, December 5, when it will consider, under debate-limitation agreement, S. 927, merchant marine—war risk insurance. Pages 22147, 22157

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported S. 692, authorizing establishment of a Federal agriculture program for Guam; and S. 2218, authorizing Secretary of the Interior to accept transfer of certain Tennessee forest lands for purposes of the Foothills Parkway.

Also, committee approved the following watershed projects: Dry Creek and Fishing Creek, Ga.; Little Cache Creek, Ill.; Bachelor Run, Ind.; Grant-Shanghai Creeks, Kans.; Clam River, Mass.; Crane Creek, Minn.; Briar Creek, Pa.; and Glen Hills, Wis.

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee, in executive session, marked up and approved for full committee consideration the civil functions section of H.R. 9140, fiscal 1964 appropriations for public works.

The full committee will meet in executive session tomorrow to consider this bill, and H.R. 7063, fiscal 1964 appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies.

STOCKPILING

Committee on Armed Services: The Stockpile Subcommittee continued its hearings on S. 2272, proposed Materials Reserve and Stockpile Act of 1963, receiving testimony from Edward A. McDermott, Director, Office of Emergency Planning; Maurice J. Connell, Commissioner, and John G. Harlan, Deputy Commissioner, both of the Defense Materials Service, GSA; Mariano Ranno, National Association of Metal Finishers; and Alfred T. Marinaro, Master Electro Platers Association.

Statements were submitted by Representatives Aspinall, Baring, and Broomfield.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call of the Chair.

MARITIME LABOR DISPUTES

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries held hearings on S. 2222, to establish procedures to facilitate the settlement of jurisdictional disputes in the maritime industry, with testimony from Ralph E. Casey, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc.; Donald W. Alexander, Palm Beach, Fla.; Ralph E. Wilson, Vice Admiral, USN (retired), vice president, J. J. Henry Co., Philadelphia; and William B. Rand, president, United States Lines Co., New York City.

Hearings continue tomorrow, with further testimony from Mr. Rand.

D.C. CRIME LAWS

Committee on the District of Columbia: Committee resumed its hearings on H.R. 7525, to amend the laws relating to crime and criminal procedure in the D.C., with testimony on those provisions of the bill dealing with indecent publications from David C. Acheson, U.S. Attorney for the D.C.; Walter N. Tobriner, President, D.C. Board of Commissioners; Roy E. Blick, Deputy Chief, D.C. Metropolitan Police Department; John C. Doerfer, general counsel, Maryland-District of Columbia-Delaware Broadcasters Association; and

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Dec. 6, 1963
For actions of Dec. 5, 1963
88th-1st Cong., 198

CONTENTS

Administrative procedure.9
Air pollution.....16,21
Appropriations.....1,14,15
Civil defense.....15
Civil rights.....5
Congressional organization.....3,14
Conservation.....29
Cotton.....22
Electrification..... 10
Expenditures.....26
Export control.....13
Federal Register.....30
Foreign aid.....19,21,23
Futures trading.....23
Law.....9
Legislative program..14,21
Loans.....24
Manpower.....21
Meat imports.....6
National Farmers Week....2
National Parks.....4
Pay.....27
Personnel.....27
Public works.....11
Puerto Rico.....12
Research.....15,18
River basins.....20
Standard containers.....17
Tobacco.....8
Water.....28
Water research.....18
Wheat.....7,25

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee reported public works and State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bills. Senate passed measure to provide annual National Farmers Week. Sen. Mundt urged action to restrict meat imports. House received conference reports on: Independent offices appropriation bill. Bill to prevent air pollution. House committee reported fruits and vegetables container standards bill. House subcommittee voted to report land-grant college water research center bill.

SENATE

1. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill (S. Rept. 746), and H. R. 7063, the State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary, and related agencies appropriation bill (S. Rept. 747). p.22395

   A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 9139, the military construction appropriation bill. pp. D959-60

2. NATIONAL FARMERS WEEK. Passed without amendment S. J Res. 128, providing that the seven-day period beginning on the first Sunday of April in each year is to be designated as National Farmers Week. p. 22435

3. CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION. Began debate on S. Con. Res. 1, to provide for the creation of a joint committee to study the organization and operation of the Congress. pp. 22435, 22449-56

4. NATIONAL PARKS. The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 6756, to enlarge the boundaries of the Mesa Verde National Park, Colo. p. D960

5. CIVIL RIGHTS. Sen. Javits urged action in enacting civil rights legislation and inserted correspondence with various departments, including this department, concerning "the extent to which Federal tax moneys are being spent to support State programs which are segregated or discriminatory." pp. 22399-408

6. MEAT IMPORTS. Sen. Mundt expressed concern and reviewed the effects of meat imports on the domestic livestock industry and urged that the proper authorities in the executive branch take such action as is necessary "to protect our domestic cattle industry against excessive imports." pp. 22436-7

7. WHEAT. Sen. Mundt urged the calling of a free world trade-aid conference "to rationalize and make consistent our present policies of foreign trade and aid" and inserted a Wall Street Journal editorial critical of proposals that the U.S. finance a sale of wheat to Russia. pp. 22435-6

8. TOBACCO. Sen. Neuberger expressed concern over possible effects of smoking on health, criticized the American Medical Association for not taking "an official position on the relationship between smoking and health," and inserted several items on the subject. pp. 22443-9

9. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE; LAW. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment S. 1466, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies (S. Rept. 745). p. 22395

10. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Young (O.) defended TVA against criticism in a recent Life magazine article and stated "the fact is that the TVA has increased Federal revenues." p. 22412

Sen. McIntyre inserted an address by a vice president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp. reviewing progress being made in producing electricity with atomic reactors. pp. 22415-8

11. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Williams (N.J.) submitted amendments intended to be proposed to S. 1856, to increase the appropriation authorization for the public works acceleration program, one of which would permit appropriations for the program to remain available until expended. p. 22397

12. PUERTO RICO. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Mansfield, H. R. 5945, to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico. pp. 22434-5

13. EXPORT CONTROL. Received from Commerce a report on Export Control for the third quarter of 1963. p. 22395

14. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced the legislative program as follows: Fri., creation of joint committee to study organization of Congress, Mon., public works appropriation bill, and Thurs., State-Justice-Commerce appropriation bill, p. 22434

Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS, 1st Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 746

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

DECEMBER 5, 1963.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 9140]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate, with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House	$4,276,116,400
Amount of increase by Senate (net)	224,871,800
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	4,500,988,200
Amount of estimates for 1964	4,561,957,000
Amount of appropriations, 1963	5,534,702,610
The bill as reported to the Senate—	
Under the estimates for 1964	60,968,800
Under the appropriation for 1963	1,033,714,410

Comprehensive River Basin Studies

Although the committee supports the concept of comprehensive planning in the development of water and land resources for the long-range public good, it is appalled at the increase in the estimated costs of these studies and desires that the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the various departments involved, reevaluate the cost and the degree of refinement contemplated for these comprehensive basin studies. The urgency of this action is apparent in light of the Presidential message on natural resources of February 23, 1961, in which it was asserted that the administration had accepted the goal set by the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources that comprehensive plans be developed by 1970 for all major basins of the Nation. The committee has been informed, however, that that goal will probably be modified to the extent of having all of these studies underway by 1970, rather than completed.

During the hearings on the activities of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation the committee had an opportunity to go into the matter of comprehensive basin planning. In one case it was noted that the cost of the study increased 600 percent since last year because the agency had adopted a new concept of what is required for comprehensive basin studies.

The cost of the studies budgeted for fiscal year 1964 requires appropriations in excess of $100 million, and the committee has been informed that the cost of the studies presently contemplated for comprehensive basin surveys will be in excess of $400 million. The committee believes that unless executive direction is exercised by the Bureau of the Budget and the heads of the agencies involved, eventually the cost will be in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

Even partial examination of the increased cost of certain comprehensive studies programed in fiscal years 1963 and 1964 tends to focus the committee's attention on the impact that this new concept could have on the fiscal requirements for general investigations of the various agencies engaged in water resource developments in future years.

A summary, by agencies, of the request for comprehensive basin studies for fiscal year 1964 follows:

Agency	Number of basins	1963 appropriation	1964 budget	Balance to complete
Department of the Army	25	$2,953,000	$4,995,000	$30,275,000
Department of the Interior	6	693,000	1,800,000	10,397,000
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	10	4,788,000	6,256,000	37,100,000
Department of Agriculture	14	756,000	2,136,000	9,082,000
Total		9,190,000	15,187,000	86,854,000

The committee notes that the studies budgeted for fiscal year 1964 will require appropriations for that year in excess of $15 million. At the present rate of appropriation requests it will take until 1970 to complete the studies presently under way; whereas, the announced goal for completing all comprehensive river basin studies is 1970.

Based on the present estimated cost of the studies now contemplated the budget request for future years will have to be increased 400 percent if the announced goals for completion of these studies are

to be met. However, based on previous experience on survey estimates, unless definite action is taken to limit the scope of these studies, the eventual cost will be nearly $1 billion. In that event, the present rate of appropriations would have to be increased a thousand percent if the completion schedule is to be met. Since surveys are principally personnel services it would be difficult to find an experienced force to carry on this work efficiently if the rate is to be increased between 400 and 1,000 percent.

In the opinion of the committee, the cost of providing studies, of the scope presently proposed, for the rest of the country, is so staggering that it will require adoption of one of the following basic courses of action: (*a*) determination on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to recommend major increases in the amounts requested for all phases of water resource development, accompanied by an accelerated expansion of personnel in each bureau; (*b*) a major revision of the timetable previously approved for the accomplishment of the comprehensive studies, together with the establishment of some sort of priority system whereby certain river basins will be told they must wait 5, 10, 15, or 20 years for their survey; or (*c*) a change in the concept as to the details required for these comprehensive studies.

If, after careful consideration, the first alternative is considered the proper course of action, that decision should be accompanied by a determination to recommend construction funds at an appropriate rate. Unless the projects to be recommended in these comprehensive reports are not going to be built for 15 or 20 years, there is no justification for detailed consideration in the present studies. There are a considerable number of projects which have been authorized for many years and should either be programed for construction in the near future or deauthorized. Furthermore, the committee believes that each agency has a vast accumulation of physical data for practically every large watershed in the country, as well as information concerning the most feasible means of solving the problems within its sphere of responsibility. Also, it must be assumed that their previous recommendations provided for the solution of the most pressing of these problems. Recognizing that there are acute situations in most States that require early solution, it would be folly to maintain that a study of these acute situations must await the completion of comprehensive studies of other basins. For this reason, the second alternative would probably be unacceptable. This is particularly true if those studies have been expended to develop projects that will not be required for some 30 years, when the economic conditions of the region might dictate an entirely different approach to the problem.

The third alternative appears to the committee to be the most practical. The basic question involved here is the cost of providing the degree of refinement to which these studies are to be carried at this time for future developments. In a dynamic civilization such as ours, detailed planning now will be substantially lost some years hence when actual project construction is imminent. In fact, in order to meet the changing needs of an area, we can expect future reassignment of storage in reservoirs previously constructed. The committee believes that full utilization of the wealth of knowledge available to each major construction agency engaged in the field of water resources should permit the economical compilation of this knowledge

into a comprehensive plan for the basin. Then subsequent projects proposed in this area can be evaluated in the light of the comprehensive plans prepared to meet the needs and potential of the region. In this way, the resources of each basin can be developed in a truly comprehensive manner without unnecessary expenditures for details which will require major revision before actual construction is initiated.

The committee believes this latter approach is feasible, particularly in view of the fact that, of necessity, our concept of the needs of the various basins of the country 50 to 100 years from now is so sketchy that a high degree of refinement in the planning for each individual phase of a comprehensive study would be unjustified.

Perhaps a better understanding of the magnitude of this entire problem can be achieved by directing our attention to one of the comprehensive studies proposed. The study that comes the nearest to being common to all four agencies is the Missouri River Basin.

Missouri River Basin comprehensive study

Agency	Through 1962	1963	1964	Balance to complete
Corps of Engineers	0	0	$250,000	$3,675,000
Bureau of Reclamation	0	0	522,000	4,300,000
Public Health [1]	0	0	100,000	2,900,000
Soil Conservation	0	0	156,000	837,000
Total			1,028,000	11,712,000
			12,740,000	

[1] Lower Missouri River only.

The committee has not been convinced of the need to spend $12,740,000 for a comprehensive study of a basin in which both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have spent large sums for previous basin surveys as well as countless surveys of tributary streams. In addition, each of these agencies has expended hundreds of millions of dollars building projects under a comprehensive plan approved by Congress.

The committee also notes that the Soil Conservation Service has spent large sums of money in flood prevention and soil conservation practices, and certainly the Public Health Service is not completely devoid of basic information in the Lower Missouri River Basin.

In the opinion of the committee, comprehensive planning should mean giving appropriate attention and evaluation to the broad needs of an area now and in the foreseeable future and only broad-scale planning for the development of water resources to achieve these goals. It does not believe that comprehensive planning need embrace the expenditures of large sums of money to conduct detailed and costly field investigations and designs of specific projects that obviously will not be built for a great many years and which would almost certainly be outmoded by the time the projects were to be placed under construction.

The committee notes that in submitting their recommendations for comprehensive basin planning in the 1964 budget the Bureau of the Budget has taken the position that they have not approved the agencies' overall cost estimate for the study or the scope of the investigation. The committee does not expect the Bureau of the Budget to take that position in connection with the 1965 budget. Both the

President and the Congress are entitled to a realistic appraisal of the cost of these surveys and the rate of appropriations that will be required in future years to complete comprehensive basin studies for all river basins in a reasonable period of time. It was a realization of the lack of these basic facts that disturbed the committee during the course of the hearings on the agencies' requests for fiscal year 1964.

The committee will expect the Bureau of the Budget, as a part of its review of the agencies request, to examine the scope and degree of refinement contemplated in the comprehensive studies of all of the agencies involved in the field of water resources. In the process of that review, it is desired that the Bureau of the Budget consult with the heads of the departments involved in an effort to obtain their complete support in developing a program of studies that will produce the information needed at a cost that will be obtainable within budgetary limitations.

The committee is pleased to note that the Bureau of the Budget has formally requested the four departments involved in comprehensive river basin planning to undertake a thorough review of their planning procedures and concepts. The Bureau of the Budget is the only agency capable of taking the leadership in insuring that the studies of all of the Federal agencies are fully coordinated so as to eliminate duplication of effort. The committee can see no reason why, for instance, four Federal agencies need collect and develop hydraulic data for the same river basin. The data developed by one agency should be made available for the use of the others. By following this procedure, the committee feels that needed studies of a reasonable scope can be financed within a realistic period of time.

The committee believes that in presenting the 1965 budget to the President for approval the Bureau of the Budget should have thoroughly explored the alternatives suggested so that in approving the 1965 budget the President and the Bureau of the Budget will be in a position to set forth a complete program for accomplishing these studies, including a proposed funding schedule. Accordingly, the committee will expect that at the time of the budget presentation for 1965, the various departments and agencies will have worked out with the Bureau of the Budget an approved schedule for financing the preparation of comprehensive basin plans for all major river basins of the Nation by 1970, or establish a new goal for the submission of these studies.

Pending receipt of that information, and affirmative action by the Congress on such a program, the various departments and agencies should not recruit additional staff beyond that required to undertake studies at the level contemplated in the 1964 program, nor should they continue their present efforts to enlist local support and pressure for additional detailed comprehensive studies.

The committee action on the specific requests for fiscal year 1964 for agencies covered by the public works bill are contained in the individual writeups for those agencies.

TITLE I—CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Cemeterial Expenses

Appropriation, 1963	$10, 333, 000
Budget estimate, 1964	10, 846, 000
House allowance	10, 800, 000
Committee recommendation	10, 800, 000

The committee recommends $10,800,000, the amount allowed by the House, and $46,000 below the budget estimate.

Corps of Engineers

The budget estimate for the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers in the amount of $1,087,026,000 compares with an appropriation of $1,044,510,050 for fiscal year 1963. The bill as passed by the House provided $1,055,782,700. The House added 30 unbudgeted general investigations items, and 36 unbudgeted construction and planning items. These new planning and construction items were financed by (1) reductions in budget estimates amounting to $3,473,000; and (2) increasing the reduction for slippage and savings from $65 million to $84,672,000; and (3) a general reduction in estimates for recreation facilities amounting to $6,033,000.

The Corps of Engineers have requested restoration of $28,845,300 under items 2 and 3. For operation and maintenance, general, the House approved $150 million, a reduction of $7,368,000 in the amount recommended in the budget.

The committee recommends $157,368,000. The committee recommendation is the budget estimate and $7,368,000 more than the amount allowed by the House.

Unbudgeted new construction starts allowed by the House will involve a future commitment of $89,560,000. The Senate committee recommended 23 additional new construction starts which involve a future commitment of $300,143,000. The bill as reported to the Senate, therefore, recommends a future commitment above the budget recommendation of $389,703,000.

The committee notes that 47 projects will be completed with the amounts recommended in the budget. The budget recommends funds to initiate 34 new starts. The future commitment of the projects recommended in the budget is $365,483,000. The future commitment recommended in the bill, therefore, is just under 1 year's construction at the rate recommended in the budget.

The committee was pleased to note that the Bureau of the Budget has continued its policy of the past few years of recommending some new starts each year. As a result of this more liberal policy on the part of the Bureau of the Budget, the committee has held back on the number of unbudgeted new starts recommended. The committee notes that generally adequate amounts for the continuation of going projects were recommended in the budget. The adequacy of these funds is reflected in the general adherence to previously approved construction schedules. While, in some cases, the committee has recommended amounts in excess of the budget estimate in order to regain a slippage in the completion schedule, generally the committee has adhered to the budgeted amount.

The committee firmly believes that in order to insure competitive bidding it is essential that adequate funds be provided to insure the most efficient utilization of contractors' equipment. The savings resulting from financing the construction of projects at an economical rate are real, and are reflected in the bids received from the contractors.

With respect to increases added by the House, the committee desires that, in accordance with a policy of long standing, the Corps of Engi-

neers allot only the amount that they are capable of expending in fiscal year 1964.

Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriations, 1963	$18, 100, 000
Budget estimate, 1964	[1] 20, 060, 000
House allowance	18, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	20, 625, 000

[1] Includes $40,000 in S. Doc. 45; 88th Cong. 1st sess.

In recommending $20,625,000 the committee approved the House action with respect to general investigations.

ALLOCATIONS OF COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee reaffirms its position that an active, well-balanced survey program is the keystone of an orderly and sound water resource program.

As in the past, the committee prefers not to make specific allocations to individual investigations. It desires, however, to call to the attention of the Corps of Engineers the testimony presented to the committee with respect to the need for increased amounts for surveys contained in its tentative allocation of budget recommendations, and expects that increased amounts will be applied to those surveys where feasible. In the allocation of the balance of the increase recommended it is desired that careful consideration be given to the needs of those areas for which testimony was presented to the committee.

General investigations, fiscal year 1964

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Amount recommended by committee
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
1. Surveys:			
(a) Navigation studies	$1,535,000	$1,828,000	$2,500,000
(b) Flood control studies	4,440,000	4,777,000	5,900,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	350,000	375,000	400,000
(d) Comprehensive basin studies:			
Big Black River, Miss	25,000	25,000	25,000
Big Muddy River, Ill	115,000	115,000	115,000
Brazos River Basin, Tex	200,000	200,000	200,000
Colorado River, Tex	215,000	215,000	215,000
Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H	250,000	250,000	250,000
Fox River, Wis	75,000	75,000	75,000
Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grand River Basin, Mich	200,000	200,000	200,000
Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C	150,000	150,000	150,000
Missouri River Basin	250,000	250,000	250,000
Neches River, Tex	110,000	110,000	110,000
Ohio River Basin review	775,000	775,000	775,000
Pascagoula River Basin, Miss	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pearl River Basin, Miss	100,000	100,000	100,000
Puget Sound area, Wasbington	150,000	150,000	150,000
Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex	250,000	250,000	250,000
Sabine River, Tex	115,000	115,000	115,000
St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo	25,000	25,000	25,000
St. Johns River Basin, Maine	85,000	85,000	85,000
St. Josepb River Basin, Mich., and Ind	100,000	100,000	100,000
Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md	330,000	330,000	330,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	325,000	325,000	325,000
Wabash River, Ind. and Ill	250,000	250,000	250,000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	250,000	250,000	250,000
Willamette River Basin, Oreg	350,000	350,000	350,000
(e) Special studies:			
Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arkansas Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana	50,000	50,000	200,000
Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.)	300,000	300,000	300,000
Great Lakes water levels	40,000	40,000	40,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y	200,000	250,000	250,000
Hurricane studies	387,000	387,000	387,000
Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J	150,000	150,000	150,000
Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y	200,000	250,000	250,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska	197,000	197,000	197,000
San Francisco Bay area survey, California	90,000	90,000	90,000
Texas coast	250,000	250,000	250,000
Hudson River siltation study			55,000
General reduction applied against basin surveys		−1,000,000	−1,500,000
Subtotal surveys	13,234,000	12,989,000	14,514,000
2. Collection and study of basic data:			
(a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	$280,000	$280,000	$280,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	480,000	480,000	480,000
(c) Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	210,000	210,000	210,000
(d) International water studies	85,000	85,000	85,000
(e) Flood plain studies	715,000	715,000	715,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000
3. Research and development:			
(a) Beach erosion development studies	820,000	820,000	820,000
(b) Hydrologic studies	185,000	185,000	185,000
(c) Engineering studies	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
(d) Plan formulation and evaluation studies	100,000	100,000	100,000
(e) Mississippi Basin model:			
(1) Construction	461,000	461,000	461,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	210,000	210,000	210,000
(f) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	1,915,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, research and development	5,056,000	4,341,000	4,341,000
General reduction due to slippage		−1,100,000	
Total, general investigations	20,060,000	18,000,000	20,625,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Appropriation, 1963	$792, 870, 500
Budget estimate, 1964	819, 486, 000
House allowance	798, 282, 700
Committee recommendation	849, 856, 000

ADVANCE ENGINEERING AND DESIGN

The committee has approved additional funds for advance planning in order to insure a steady flow of well-planned projects for consideration in future years. The committee has recommended $22,328,000 for this purpose, which is $2,453,000 above the House and $3,313,000 above the budget estimate.

ALLOCATION OF SENATE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The allocation of the amount recommended by the committee for the individual projects is shown in the accompanying table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964

Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama:								
Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N) Holt lock and dam	$33,700,000	$4,457,000	$7,700,000		$7,700,000		$7,700,000	
(MP) Jones Bluff lock and dam	52,600,000	416,000		$250,000		$250,000		$250,000
(MP) Millers Ferry lock and dam	53,200,000	1,624,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N) Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel	6,600,000	4,148,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) **Paint Rock River**	840,000	609,000	231,000		231,000		231,000	
(N) *Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss*	263,000,000	1,494,000						225,000
(MP) **Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (National wildlife refuge lands Alabama and Georgia)**	500,000		500,000				500,000	
West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (*See Georgia.*)								
Alaska:								
(N) *Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin*	965,000	44,000					921,000	
(MP) *Snettishan power project*	29,400,000	[1] 95,000		225,000		225,000		300,000
Arizona:								
(FC) Alamo Reservoir	12,600,000	1,164,000	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC) *Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir*	19,200,000	245,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Tucson diversion channel	6,300,000	758,000	1,750,000		1,750,000		1,750,000	
Arkansas:								
(N) Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
(*a*) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	133,000,000	74,201,000	18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000	
(*b*) Navigation locks and dams	447,000,000	5,619,000	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
(MP) Beaver Reservoir	46,600,000	28,028,000	10,300,000		10,300,000		10,300,000	
(MP) **Bull Shoals Reservoir additions of units Nos. 7 and 8 Arkansas and Missouri**	5,200,000	4,633,000	567,000		567,000		567,000	
(MP) Dardanelle lock and dam	84,000,000	35,095,000	20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC) *De Queen Reservoir*	10,400,000	56,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(MP) Degray Reservoir	49,300,000	2,715,000	2,350,000		2,350,000		2,350,000	
(FC) *Dierks Reservoir*	9,780,000	35,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Garland City	948,000	230,000					250,000	
(FC) Gillam Reservoir	13,400,000	750,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP) **Greers Ferry Reservoir**	46,700,000	43,783,000	2,917,000		2,917,000		2,917,000	
(FC) *Maniece Bayou, upstream extension*	673,000	60,000			200,000		200,000	
(FC) *McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas*	351,000	[1] 5,000						44,000
(FC) Millwood Reservoir	55,700,000	12,514,000	15,600,000		15,600,000		15,600,000	
(MP) *Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit*	1,360,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(N) Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	78,000,000	890,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,300,000	
(N) *Ozark lock and dam*	36,300,000	633,000		285,000		285,000		285,000
(FC) Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	10,200,000	9,420,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	

(FC)	*Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts*	1,371,000	[1] 45,000					75,000
	California:							
(FC)	*Alameda Creek*	16,200,000	220,000		250,000	250,000		250,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	2,920,000	436,000	600,000		600,000	600,000	
(FC)	*Buchanan Reservoir*	14,600,000	[1] 115,000				125,000	125,000
(FC)	Camanche Reservoir	10,670,000	3,111,000	3,800,000		3,800,000	3,800,000	
(FC)	*Corte Madera Creek*	5,780,000	[1] 78,000					20,000
(R)	**Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)**	500,000	200,000	300,000		300,000	300,000	
(N)	*Dana Point Harbor*	3,760,000	[1] 30,000				95,000	95,000
(FC)	*Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement*	45,900,000	[1] 80,000		150,000		200,000	200,000
(FC)	*Hidden Reservoir*	15,800,000	[1] 42,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	318,000,000	254,310,000	15,000,000		15,000,000	15,000,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	12,450,000	8,065,000	610,000		610,000	610,000	
(N)	Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor	4,330,000	2,336,000	1,350,000		1,350,000	1,350,000	
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (*See Nevada.*)							
(FC)	*Merced River Reservoirs*	12,000,000	[1] 50,000		25,000		25,000	25,000
(FC)	*Mormon Slough*	2,060,000	[1] 40,000					50,000
(FC)	**New Hogan Reservoir**	14,310,000	12,060,000	2,250,000		2,250,000	2,250,000	
(MP)	*New Melones Reservoir*	116,000,000	284,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
(N)	*Noyo River and Harbor*	13,500,000	75,000		150,000		150,000	150,000
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	66,375,000	14,179,000	8,000,000		4,555,000	4,555,000	
(N)	**Redondo Beach King Harbor**	4,840,000	3,890,000	950,000		950,000	950,000	
(N)	*Redwood City Harbor*	670,000	[1] 10,000			660,000	660,000	
(FC)	*Redwood Creek*	2,850,000	[1] 50,000		50,000		50,000	50,000
(FC)	**Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)**	13,822,000	13,487,000	335,000		335,000	335,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	15,400,000	350,000	700,000		700,000	700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	12,500,000	5,945,000	1,500,000		70,000	1,500,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	2,030,000	271,000	800,000		800,000	800,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	41,340,000	38,571,000	350,000		350,000	350,000	
(FC)	**Sacramento River flood control project**	69,100,000	68,200,000	900,000		840,000	900,000	
(N)	*Santa Barbora Harbor*	3,080,000	[1] 40,000					50,000
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursment)	[2] 1,000,000	80,000	50,000		50,000	50,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant)	1,880,000	1,610,000	100,000		100,000	100,000	
(FC)	*Tahchevah Creek*	1,110,000	160,000			200,000	200,000	
(BE)	*Ventura Pierpoint orea (reimbursement)*	[2] 818,000	[1] 3,000	122,000		122,000	122,000	
(FC)	*Walnut Creek*	21,300,000	363,000	100,000		500,000	300,000	
(FC)	*West Fork Reservoir*	3,900,000	275,000		80,000		80,000	80,000
	Colorado:							
(FC)	*Trinidad Reservoir*	21,000,000	379,000		86,000		86,000	86,000
	Connecticut:							
(FC)	*Ansonia-Derby*	5,640,000	[1] 20,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
(FC)	*Block Rock Reservoir*	3,550,000	60,000		150,000		150,000	150,000
(FC)	*Colebrook River Reservoir*	11,300,000	320,000		250,000		250,000	250,000
(R)	*Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments)*	640,000			60,000		60,000	60,000
(N)	*Connecticut River below Hartford, North Cove of Old Saybrook*	581,000	[1] 3,000				578,000	
(FC)	**East Branch Reservoir**	1,770,000	1,085,000	685,000		685,000	685,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	3,000,000	641,000	1,600,000		1,600,000	1,600,000	
(FC)	*Hop Brook Reservoir*	2,600,000	70,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
(FC)	*New London Barrier*	2,431,000	[1] 30,000					50,000
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir	2,700,000	614,000	900,000		900,000	900,000	
(BE)	Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement)	[2] 103,000	39,000	32,000		32,000	32,000	
(FC)	*Stamford*	3,742,000	401,000	300,000		300,000	300,000	
(FC)	*Sucker Brook Reservoir*	780,000	[1] 8,000		90,000		90,000	90,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	5,380,000	512,000	1,700,000		1,700,000	1,700,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 24.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Delaware:								
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes)	$1,300,000	$530,000	$500,000		$500,000		$500,000	
(R)	**Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)**	1,356,000	525,000	831,000		831,000		831,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	98,840,000	6,675,000	11,000,000		11,000,000		12,000,000	
	Florida:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	4,757,000	1,730,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Bakers Haulover Inlet	309,000	59,000	204,000		204,000		250,000	
(N)	*Canaveral Harbor*	8,147,000	110,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	263,000,000	96,273,000	14,000,000		14,000,000		15,500,000	
(N)	*Cross Florida barge canal*	145,300,000	1,905,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway:								
	(*a*) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	8,550,000	3,732,000	950,000		950,000		1,200,000	
	(*b*) **Jacksonville to Miami**	11,400,000	9,315,000	2,085,000		2,085,000		2,085,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor	4,050,000	390,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	[2] 543,000	168,000	9,000		9,000		9,000	
(N)	*Palm Beach Harbor*	5,120,000	110,000					250,000	
(N)	*Pensacola Harbor*	447,000	[1] 23,000					299,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	6,460,000	3,566,000	575,000		575,000		575,000	
	Georgia:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(MP)	Carters Dam	40,600,000	2,568,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	*Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin*	610,000	[1] 5,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C.	3,824,000	3,554,000			270,000		270,000	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(MP)	*West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.*	53,000,000	169,000		$350,000		$350,000		$350,000
	Hawaii:								
(N)	*Hilo Harbor*	21,800,000	795,000		600,000		600,000		600,000
(R)	*Kahului Harbor (breakwater)*	2,620,000	100,000	800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	*Kaunakakai Harbor*	7,970,000	[1] 44,000						100,000
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	1,270,000	257,000	766,000		766,000		766,000	
	Idaho:								
(FC)	**Boise Valley**	504,000	95,000	409,000		409,000		409,000	
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	195,000,000	4,671,000	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	*Ririe Reservoir*	7,061,000	109,000		375,000		375,000		375,000

	Illinois:							
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	13,838,000	1,118,000	1,400,000		1,400,000	1,400,000	
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:							
	(a) *27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)*	13,950,000	160,000	500,000		500,000	500,000	
	(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor	8,000,000	1,461,000	2,500,000		2,500,000	2,500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	36,200,000	16,093,000	5,700,000		5,700,000	5,900,000	
(R)	*Chicago Harbor (breakwater)*	1,580,000	30,000	300,000		300,000	300,000	
(N)	*Chicago Harbor—1962 act*	1,560,000	[1] 15,000					27,000
(FC)	*Clear Lake Special Drainage District*	2,200,000	49,000		51,000		51,000	51,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	20,800,000	19,761,000	300,000		300,000	300,000	
(FC)	*Freeport*	3,215,000	104,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	87,500,000	52,552,000	6,100,000		6,100,000	6,100,000	
(FC)	*Indian Grave Drainage District*	5,700,000	64,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (*See Indiana.*)							
(N)	*Kaskaskia River*	61,200,000	286,000		300,000		300,000	300,000
(FC)	*Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred)*	1,160,000			10,000		10,000	10,000
(FC)	*McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District*	3,700,000	[1] 6,000		80,000		80,000	80,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:							
	(a) Regulating works	63,800,000	51,421,000	2,300,000		2,300,000	2,300,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	43,000,000	40,051,000	400,000		400,000	400,000	
(FC)	*Mount Carmel*	1,500,000	108,000	300,000		300,000	300,000	
(FC)	*Oakley Reservoir*	31,600,000	154,000		200,000		200,000	200,000
(FC)	*Rend Lake Reservoir*	36,000,000	499,000		501,000		501,000	501,000
(FC)	*Richland Creek*	5,060,000	[1] 39,000		100,000		100,000	100,000
(FC)	*Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee*	1,180,000	55,000				150,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	20,900,000	1,025,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
(FC)	**Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown)**	5,530,000	4,835,000	695,000		695,000	695,000	
(FC)	*Sny Island Levee Drainage District*	8,900,000	154,000		166,000		166,000	166,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	4,380,000	554,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	17,000,000	7,866,000	3,500,000		3,500,000	3,500,000	
(FC)	*Tri-Pond levee*	1,260,000	60,000				300,000	
	Indiana:							
(FC)	*Brookville Reservoir*	26,400,000	85,000		200,000		200,000	200,000
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (*See Illinois.*)							
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam Indiana and Kentucky	78,400,000	4,289,000	9,871,000		9,871,000	9,871,000	
(FC)	Evansville	15,300,000	3,458,000	800,000		800,000	800,000	
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	17,700,000	1,001,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)							
(FC)	*Island levee, Indiana and Illinois*	1,780,000	[1] 12,000					50,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	9,140,000	510,000	825,000		825,000	1,000,000	
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee	2,050,000	926,000	650,000		650,000	750,000	
	McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)							
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	26,700,000	2,455,000	5,100,000		5,100,000	5,100,000	
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir	6,750,000	2,161,000	2,600,000		2,600,000	2,600,000	
(N)	*Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky*	60,500,000	222,000		250,000		250,000	250,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	19,100,000	2,891,000	3,520,000		3,520,000	4,000,000	
(N)	*Uniontown locks and dams, Indiana and Kentucky*	61,300,000	425,000		200,000		200,000	750,000	200,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 24.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Iowa:								
Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)								
(FC) *Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge*	$1,220,000	$82,000			$150,000		$150,000	
(FC) *Dubuque*	5,650,000	[1] 50,000				$35,000		$35,000
(FC) Floyd River and tributaries	12,700.000	5,749,000	$3,800,000		3,722,000		3,722,000	
(FC) *Indian Creek Dam*	1,350,000	65,000		$45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC) Iowa River Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	7,230,000	1,290,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) **Little Sioux River**	15,500,000	14,352,000	1,148,000		1,148,000		1,148,000	
(FC) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	85,300,000	32,232,000	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
(*a*) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	115,000,000	84,132,000	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(*b*) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	121,000,000	110,902,000	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(*c*) Kansas City to the mouth	132,600,000	124,859,000	2,700,000		2,700,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	3,040,000	2,256,000	200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC) *Rathbun Reservoir*	23,600,000	555,000			400,000		400,000	
(FC) Red Rock Reservoir	81,000,000	18,702,000	11,200,000		11,200,000		11,200,000	
(FC) *Saylorville Reservoir*	36,500,000	700,000			400,000		400,000	
Kansas:								
(FC) *Atchison*	3,600,000	[1] 15,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC) *Big Hill Reservoir*	4,100,000	[1] 35,000						35,000
(FC) *Clinton Reservoir*	28,400,000	[1] 22,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(FC) Council Grove Reservoir	11,200,000	8,922,000	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC) *Dodge City*	2,200,000	74,000		185,000		185,000		185,000
(FC) Elk City Reservoir	22,300,000	3,480,000	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(FC) John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	29,800,000	20,942,000	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC) Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	43,000,000	41,582,000	580,000		580,000		580,000	
(FC) *Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)*	19,000,000	[1] 17,000						50,000
(FC) *Marion Reservoir*	14,600,000	260,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) *Melvern Reservoir*	23,300,000	295,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC) *Merriam*	992,000	10.000						50,000
(FC) Milford Reservoir	61,200,000	13,063,000	14,925,000		14,925,000		14,925,000	
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) *Osawatomie*	1,210,000	46,000		39,000		39,000		39,000

(FC)	Perry Reservoir	41,000,000	1,450,000	3,000,000		3,000,000	3,000,000	
(FC)	**Pomona Reservoir**	14,100,000	12,213,000	1,887,000		1,887,000	1,887,000	
(FC)	Topeka	22,400,000	10,649,000	3,500,000		3,500,000	3,500,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	21,200,000	9,503,000	6,600,000		6,600,000	6,600,000	
	Kentucky:							
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	150,000,000	96,556,000	27,000,000		27,000,000	27,000,000	
(FC)	**Barron River Reservoir**	24,500,000	17,433,000	7,067,000		7,067,000	7,067,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)							
(N)	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	71,500,000	56,481,000	9,200,000		9,200,000	10,000,000	
(FC)	*Carr Fork Reservoir*	10,700,000	[1] 20,000		[2] 320,000			250,000
(FC)	*Cave Run Reservoir*	24,500,000	110,000		220,000	220,000		220,000
(MP)	*Celina Dam (deferred)*	39,100,000	160,000		75,000	75,000		75,000
(FC)	**Corbin**	754,000	484,000	270,000		270,000	270,000	
(FC)	*Cumberland*	500,000	[1] 18,000		40,000	40,000		40,000
(FC)	*Eagle Creek Reservoir*	10,700,000	[1] 20,000					100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	56,900,000	9,196,000	9,500,000		9,500,000	9,500,000	
(FC)	*Grayson Reservoir*	14,500,000	496,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	21,000,000	1,033,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	2,000,000	
(N)	McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	52,000,000	37,915,000	4,220,000		4,220,000	4,220,000	
	Mound City lock and dam, Illinois and Kentucky (not authorized). (*See Illinois.*)							
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (*See Indiana.*)							
(FC)	*Red River Reservoir*	9,480,000	[1] 20,000		50,000	50,000		50,000
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. *See Indiana.*)							
	Louisiana:							
(N)	Aquatic plant control Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	6,491,000	3,229,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway	4,680,000	603,000	800,000		800,000	800,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	19,200,000	1,623,000	4,200,000		4,200,000	4,200,000	
(N)	*Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier*	3,340,000	9,000		103,000	103,000	47,000	103,000
(FC)	*Campti Clarence levee*	1,320,000	70,000		23,000	23,000	100,000	23,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	7,530,000	634,000	800,000		800,000	800,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	95,000,000	34,558,000	9,000,000		9,000,000	9,000,000	
(FC)	*New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)*	7,580,000	340,000	100,000		100,000	100,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)							
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)							
(FC)	*Twelve Mile Bayou*	276,000	18,000				[4] (258,000)	
	Maine:							
(N)	*Kennebunk River*	[3]		[3]			[3]	
(N)	*Narraguagus River*	507,000	[1] 7,000			500,000	500,000	
(N)	Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	7,635,000	585,000	2,000,000		1,000,000	2,000,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (*See New Hampshire.*)							
(N)	**Searsport Harbor (1962 act)**	738,000	20,000	718,000		718,000	718,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Maryland:								
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel	$28,000,000	$9,429,000	$4,500,000		$4,500,000		$4,500,000	
(FC)	*Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va.*	51,000,000	[1] 34,000		$100,000		$100,000		$100,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal) part II. (See Delaware.)								
	Massachusetts:								
(N)	*Boston Harbor, Chelsea River*	2,516,000	[1] 16,000				40,000		40,000
(R)	*Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge*	1,300,000	38,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	**Chicopee Falls**	1,880,000	495,000	1,385,000		1,385,000		1,385,000	
(FC)	*Conant Brook Reservoir*	2,080,000	230,000	350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	*Gloucester Harbor*	1,120,000	[1] 20,000			500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	7,000,000	2,884,000	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	11,386,000	2,275,000	3,634,000		3,634,000		3,634,000	
(N)	*Plymouth Harbor (1962 act)*	1,230,000	[1] 10,000				35,000		35,000
(BE)	*Plymouth Town Beach (Reimbursement)*	[2] 61,000	[1] 2,000	7,000		7,000		7,000	
(FC)	Three Rivers	1,270,000	410,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	*Wareham-Marion*	3,852,000	113,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	*Westfield*	3,264,000	194,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	Michigan:								
(R)	*Charlevoi Harbor (piers and revetments)*	1,200,000			30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	**Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel**	5,500,000	4,015,000	1,485,000		1,485,000		1,485,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor	812,000	15,000					200,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	125,500,000	116,967,000	800,000		800,000		800,000	
(R)	*Ludington Harbor (North revetment)*	405,000	40,000	150,000		150,000		150,000	
(R)	*Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)*	1,380,000	45,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wiseonsin.)								
(N)	*Muskegon Harbor*	660,000	[1] 10,000		18,000	100,000		100,000	
(R)	*Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)*	1,150,000			30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	*Ontonagon Harbor*	5,070,000	[1] 29,000						75,000
(FC)	*Rouge River*	9,430,000	84,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	St. Marys River: New Poe lock	39,000,000	7,205,000	242,000		242,000		500,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	19,300,000	604,000	600,000		600,000		600,000	
	Minnesota:								
(N)	Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:								
	(*a*) Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels	4,370,000	364,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	(*b*) **Outer harbor, 32-foot to 27-foot channels**	4,240,000	3,078,000	1,162,000		1,162,000		1,162,000	
(FC)	**Marshall, Redwood River**	1,970,000	1,274,000	696,000		696,000		696,000	
(R)	*Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)*	700,000	30,000	200,000		200,000		200,000	

(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	6,420,000	3,308,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	*Winona*	2,140,000	240,000	200,000		200,000		200,000	
	Mississippi:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson	3,636,000	627,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	*Natchez*	368,000	34,000					115,000	
(FC)	*Okatibbee Creek Reservoir*	6,800,000	211,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	4,900,000	1,430,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)								
	Missouri:								
	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	**Canton**	1,460,000	1,160,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo	4,300,000	1,184,000			400,000		400,000	
(FC)	**Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only**	5,250,000	4,650,000	600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	*Gregory Drainage District*	1,100,000	60,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	*Hannibal*	4,570,000	56,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(MP)	*Joanna Reservoir*	66,000,000	507,000		300,000		350,000		350,000
	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(MP)	*Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir*	140,000,000	1,155,000		650,000		650,000	350,000	650,000
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	3,120,000	1,200,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
	Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	6,930,000	5,955,000	330,000		330,000		330,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District	1,250,000	175,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	103,000,000	27,501,000	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	51,000,000	1,625,000	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
	Montana:								
(MP)	*Libby Reservoir*	332,000,000	5,067,00		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000
	Nebraska:								
(FC)	*Clarkson*	231,000	26,000					[4] (205,000)	
(FC)	Gering Valley	5,740,000	851,000	650,000		650,000		650,000	
(FC)	*Little Papillion Creek*	2,250,000	58,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	*Norfolk*	3,580,000	95,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	20,200,000	4,245,000	4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000	
	Nevada:								
(FC)	*Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev*	2,840,000	[1] 40,000						100,000
	New Hampshire:								
(N)	*Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H.*	7,520,000	120,000			1,000,000		1,000,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 24.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	New Jersey:								
(R)	*Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)*	$1,500,000	$15,000	$400,000		$400,000		$400,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages) Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	28,100,000	297,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		3,000,000	
(R)	*Manasquan River (bulkheads)*	522,000	10,000	350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	*Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel*	1,532,000						400,000	
(R)	*New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike) New York and New Jersey*	564,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	[2] 3,216,000	393,000	690,000		690,000		690,000	
(MP)	*Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., and N.J.*	95,000,000	[1] 175,000		$250,000		$250,000		$250,000
	New Mexico:								
(FC)	*Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act)*	2,100,000	110,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
(FC)	*Cochiti Reservoir*	48,400,000	792,000		308,000		308,000		308,000
(FC)	*Galisteo Reservoir*	16,700,000	405,000		220,000		220,000		220,000
(FC)	*Las Cruces*	3,530,000	[1] 78,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	**Socorro**	2,930,000	1,695,000	1,235,000		1,235,000		1,235,000	
	New York:								
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:								
	(*a*) *Outer Harbor—(1962 modification)*	3,240,000	[1] 33,000			250,000		250,000	
	(*b*) **South Entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels**	2,250,000	1,543,000	707,000		707,000		707,000	
(N)	*Buttermilk Channel*	2,245,000	[1] 19,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet, Long Island	3,230,000	1,139,000	500,000		500,000		600,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	19,700,000	955,000	2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000	
(N)	**Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act)**	2,351,000	1,434,000	917,000		917,000		917,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	25,900,000	26,013,000	380,000		380,000		380,000	
(FC)	**Herkimer**	1,300,000	1,014,000	286,000		286,000		286,000	
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	28,600,000	12,572,000	5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	*Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet*	4,480,000	223,000			300,000		300,000	
(FC)	*Lackawanna*	2,390,000	281,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	*Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River*	6,500,000	147,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(R)	*Little Sodus Bay (piers)*	550,000			20,000		20,000		20,000
	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)								
(N)	*Oswego Harbor (1962 act)*	1,260,000	[1] 42,000				60,000		60,000
(N)	**Rochester Harbor**	2,295,000	1,270,000	1,025,000		1,025,000		1,025,000	
(FC)	*Rosendale*	2,450,000	[1] 37,000				100,000		100,000
(FC)	*Salamanca*	1,520,000	[1] 50,000				20,000		20,000

(FC)	South Amsterdam	1,760,000	405,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
	North Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	*Carolina Beach, hurricone flood protection*	[2] 920,000	[1] 50,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(BE)	*Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach*	[2] 410,000	[1] 5,000					54,000	
(FC)	*New Hope Reservoir (not authorized)*	25,293,000	[1] 150,000						180,000
(FC)	*Swift Creek*	915,000	[1] 76,000			250,000		250,000	
(N)	*Wilmington Horbor, 38- and 48 foot depth (1962 act)*	6,400,000	[1] 28,000						135,000
(FC)	*Wrightsville Beach*	[3]		[3]				[3]	
	North Dakota:								
(FC)	*Bowman Haley Reservoir*	2,810,000	195,000					300,000	
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	291,000,000	288,978,000	700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	*Missouri River bonk stabilizotion between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (Not authorized)*	3,000,000						300,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)								
	Ohio:								
(N)	**Ashtabula Harbor 27-30-foot channels deepen turning area**	2,180,000	1,797,000	383,000		383,000		383,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	70,300,000	4,481,000	7,000,000		7,000,000		12,000,000	
(FC)	*Big Darby Creek Reservoir*	26,500,000	284,000		266,000		266,000		266,000
(FC)	*Buck Creek Reservoir*	8,320,000	118,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	*Caesar Creek Reservoir*	14,410,000	23,000				75,000		75,000
	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	Cleveland Harbor:								
	(*a*) Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	18,300,000	779,000	900,000		900,000		900,000	
	(*c*) *Deepen East Basin to 27-28 feet (1962 act)*	1,580,000	[1] 43,000						27,000
(R)	**Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters)**	582,000	282,000	300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	*Conneaut Harbor*	9,170,000	[1] 118,000			225,000		225,000	
(FC)	*Deer Creek Reservoir*	16,400,000	284,000		216,000		216,000		216,000
(FC)	*East Fork Reservoir*	17,215,000	86,000				75,000		75,000
(FC)	*Fremont*	4,600,000	[1] 82,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	*Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia*	58,600,000	320,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	19,800,000	2,932,000	4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	*Manchester (deferred)*	1,330,000	[1] 10,000				8,000		8,000
(FC)	*Mount Vernon*	[3]		[3]				[3]	
(FC)	*North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir*	2,980,000	[1] 26,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC)	*Point Creek Reservoir*	21,900,000	284,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	56,200,000	38,969,000	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N)	*Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia*	79,300,000	521,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	*Salt Creek Reservoir*	13,800,000	[1] 32,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	**Sandusky Harbor**	3,730,000	2,199,000	1,531,000		1,531,000		1,531,000	
(R)	**Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)**	580,000	210,000	370,000		370,000		370,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	**Toledo Harbor**	11,400,000	5,132,000	6,268,000		6,268,000		6,268,000	
(R)	*Vermillion Horbor (minor rehabilitation)*			(200,000)		(200,000)		(200,000)	
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	12,700,000	3,945,000	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
(N)	*Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia*	68,600,000	[1] 50,000						150,000
(FC)	*Youngstown, Crab Creek*	2,460,000	[1] 35,000		50,000		50,000		50,000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 24.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Oklahoma:								
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	*Birch Reservoir*	$3,500,000	$25,000		$125,000		$125,000		$125,000
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	39,600,000	3,567,000	$3,900,000		$3,900,000		$3,900,000	
(FC)	*Copan Reservoir*	26,500,000	[1] 22,000				100,000		100,000
(MP)	Eufaula Reservoir	120,000,000	96,639,000	18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC)	*Hugo Reservoir*	22,600,000	[1] 105,000						100,000
(FC)	*Kaw Reservoir*	86,600,000	145,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	127,000,000	88,548,000	15,500,000		15,500,000		15,500,000	
(FC)	*Optima Reservoir*	21,100,000	276,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	21,200,000	1,038,000	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(MP)	*Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam*	106,000,000	996,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	*Skiatook Reservoir*	23,700,000	[1] 23,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(N)	*Webbers Falls lock and dam*	63,200,000	454,000		370,000		370,000		370,000
	Oregon:								
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	30,500,000	1,166,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	*Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington*	21,400,000	230,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	*Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington*	11,200,000	3,272,000		170,000		170,000		170,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington	9,300,000	1,992,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(MP)	Cougar Reservoir	54,700,000	48,061,000	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	27,800,000	3,450,000	3,740,000		3,740,000		3,740,000	
(FC)	*Fern Ridge Reservoir modification*	[3]		[3]				[3]	
(FC)	*Gate Creek Reservoir*	19,400,000	[1] 98,000						100,000
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	79,900,000	13,674,000	11,650,000		11,650,000		11,650,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	410,000,000	114,480,000	57,000,000		57,000,000		57,000,000	
(MP)	*Lost Creek Reservoir*	77,200,000	[1] 60,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	8,870,000	1,261,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor	2,140,000	540,000	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	12,600,000	9,540,000	600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin, channel improvement and major drainage:								
	Shelton Ditch	1,860,000	[1] 6,000						10,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	18,100,000	945,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	

	Pennsylvania:								
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	109,000,000	45,998,000	21,227,000		21,227,000		21,227,000	
(FC)	*Beltzville Reservoir*	14,500,000	135,000		240,000		240,000		240,000
(FC)	**Bethlehem**	4,650,000	4,280,000	370,000		370,000		370,000	
(FC)	*Blanchard Reservoir*	22,900,000	522,000		428,000		428,000		428,000
(FC)	Butler	1,820,000	570,000	750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	21,100,000	6,816,000	6,800,000		6,800,000		6,800,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	12,900,000	777,000	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(FC)	*Elkland*	1,670,000	111,000	250,000		250,000		250,000	
(FC)	*Latrobe*	3,074,000	123,000		117,000		117,000		117,000
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	31,000,000	18,852,000	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	*Muddy Creek Reservoir*	7,640,000	[1] 49,000						25,000
(FC)	*Raystown Reservoir*	32,150,000	[1] 153,000				150,000		150,000
(FC)	*Scranton*	1,910,000	[1] 35,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	36,000,000	13,492,000	10,800,000		10,800,000		10,800,000	
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (*See New Jersey.*)								
(FC)	Turtle Creek	16,100,000	1,518,000	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	*Union City Reservoir*	9,230,000	108,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
	Puerto Rico:								
(N)	**San Juan Harbor**	9,718,000	5,085,000	4,633,000		4,633,000		4,633,000	
	Rhode Island:								
(FC)	Fox Point Barrier	11,230,000	7,621,000	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	5,764,000	584,000	1,450,000		1,450,000		1,450,000	
(FC)	*Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier*	1,172,000	[1] 20,000				50,000		50,000
(R)	**Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters)**	2,000,000	1,530,000	470,000		470,000		470,000	
(FC)	*Point Judith—Hurricane barrier*	2,458,000	[1] 44,000				50,000		50,000
	South Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
	South Dakota:								
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	112,000,000	54,775,000	23,800,000		23,800,000		23,800,000	
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	194,900,000	191,856,000	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (*See North Dakota.*)								
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	345,000,000	311,703,000	5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000	
	Tennessee:								
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam	43,200,000	1,066,000	2,400,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	32,200,000	1,446,000	3,700,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(BA)	*Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn*	846,000	[1] 7,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Texas:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	13,000,000	830,000	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	*Big Fossil Creek*	1,970,000	170,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	*Big Pine Reservoir*	9,200,000	[1] 40,000						
(R)	*Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)*	2,000,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	*Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act)*	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	55,800,000	32,038,000	3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000	

See footnotes at end of table, p. 24.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Texas—Continued								
(FC) Canyon Reservoir	$17,500,000	$13,192,000	$3,682,000		$3,682,000		$3,682,000	
(FC) *Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension*	5,420,000	88,000		$132,000		$132,000		$132,000
(FC) *Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension*	2,369,000	165,000	500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) *Freeport and vicinity*	3,850,000	[1] 70,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(R) *Freeport Harbor (minor rehabilitation)*			(370,000)		(370,000)		(370,000)	
(R) Galveston Harbor (jetties)	11,100,000	2,235,000	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(R) *Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Colorado River locks (minor rehabilitation)*			(180,000)		(180,000)		(180,000)	
(N) *Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios*	829,000	[1] 11,000				30,000		30,000
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	8,500,000	4,019,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, New Orleans to Houston, La. and Tex. (See Louisiana.)								
(R) **Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes**	587,000	25,000	562,000		562,000		562,000	
(N) Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	19,190,000	7,695,000	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC) *Lake Kemp Reservoir*	8,600,000	[1] 52,000						50,000
(FC) *Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement*	25,900,000	[1] 100,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N) Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	13,200,000	4,949,000	7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC) *North Fork Reservoir*	13,100,000	[1] 10,000						50,000
(FC) *Pat Mayse Reservoir*	8,100,000	[1] 40,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola	5,600,000	512,000	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(R) *Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)*	4,500,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC) *Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)*	23,500,000	211,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC) **Proctor Reservoir**	14,500,000	12,500,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(N) Sabine-Neches Waterway:								
(*a*) *40 foot project and channel to Echo*	20,900,000	85,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(*b*) **Rectification and widening (1954 act)**	10,700,000	8,562,000	2,138,000		2,138,000		2,138,000	
(MP) Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	58,090,000	39,082,000	12,450,000		12,450,000		12,450,000	
(FC) San Antonio Channel	21,200,000	6,165,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Somerville Reservoir	18,800,000	2,090,000	8,100,000		8,100,000		8,100,000	
(FC) Stillhouse Hollow Dam	20,600,000	2,321,000	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FC) Texas City	15,700,000	1,900,000	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R) **Texas City channel (dikes)**	875,000	40,000	835,000		835,000		835,000	
(FC) *Vince and Little Vince Bayous*	2,295,000	[1] 21,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(FC) Waco Reservoir	47,400,000	35,744,000	8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000	
(N) *Wallisville Reservoir*	9,920,000	[1] 35,000		200,000		200,000		200,000

	Vermont:							
(R)	**Burlington Harbor (breakwater)**	1,430,000	875,000	555,000		555,000	555,000	
(FC)	*Victory Reservoir (deferred)*	1,900,000	113,000		65,000		65,000	65,000
	Virginia:							
(R)	**Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.)**	620,000		620,000		620,000	620,000	
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	20,700,000	10,195,000	4,000,000		4,000,000	4,000,000	
(FC)	*Norfolk*	1,770,000	155,000	250,000		250,000	250,000	
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	6,080,000	690,000	2,100,000		2,100,000	2,100,000	
	Washington:							
(FC)	Colfax	4,380,000	2,060,000	600,000		600,000	600,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)							
	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)							
(FC)	*Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2*	1,470,000	61,000		39,000		39,000	39,000
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)							
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	146,000,000	3,475,000	11,000,000		11,000,000	11,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)							
(MP)	*Lower Granite lock and dam*	151,000,000	1,216,000		884,000		884,000	884,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	162,000,000	29,299,000	23,000,000		23,000,000	23,000,000	
(N)	**Port Townsend**	642,000	44,000	598,000		598,000	598,000	
(FC)	*Pullman*	2,150,000	78,000		80,000		80,000	80,000
(FC)	**Sammamish River**	1,928,000	1,199,000	729,000		729,000	729,000	
(N)	*Swinomish Slough*	910,000	[1] 22,000			150,000	150,000	
(N)	*Tacoma Harbor*	2,480,000	[1] 21,000				150,000	
(FC)	*Washougal area*	1,718,000	75,000			100,000	100,000	
	West Virginia:							
(FC)	*Barboursville*	[3]					[3] (150,000)	
(FC)	*Beech Fork Reservoir*	11,400,000	[1] 19,000					150,000
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)							
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W.Va. (See Maryland.)							
(FC)	*Buckhannon*	1,330,000	57,000		73,000		73,000	73,000
(FC)	*East Lynn Reservoir*	14,000,000	120,000		280,000	280,000	220,000	280,000
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)							
(FC)	*Justice Reservoir*	62,600,000	62,000		300,000	150,000		300,000
	Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)							
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	23,700,000	9,764,000	5,058,000		5,058,000	5,058,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)							
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	40,800,000	24,030,000	10,900,000		10,900,000	10,900,000	
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)							

See footnotes at end of table, p. 24.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
				Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Wisconsin:								
	Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)								
(FC)	Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	$8,250,000	$931,000	$200,000		$200,000		$200,000	
(N)	*Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)*	4,420,000	[1] 14,000						$50,000
(N)	*Kenosha Harbor*	710,000	23,000			200,000		200,000	
(R)	*Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)*	1,000,000			$30,000		$30,000		30,000
(FC)	*Kickapoo River*	16,800,000	[1] 158,000				50,000		50,000
(R)	Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis.	1,280,000	800,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N)	*Milwaukee Harbor*	4,360,000	[1] 12,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(R)	Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	1,650,000	618,000	600,000		600,000		600,000	
(R)	**Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier)**	740,000	552,000	188,000		188,000		188,000	
(R)	Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal	1,138,000	393,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
	Wyoming:								
(FC)	**Jackson Hole**	2,510,000	2,031,000	479,000		479,000		479,000	
	Miscellaneous:								
(FC)	Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation			4,000,000		4,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing							750,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000			2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(BE)	Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000			50,000		50,000		50,000	
	Projects deferred for restudy				(150,000)		(158,000)	(158,000)	
	Recreation facilities, completed projects			4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Small authorized projects			2,128,000		2,128,000		2,750,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)			2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Employees compensation			72,000		72,000		72,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages			−65,000,000		−84,672,000		−65,000,000	
	General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities					−6,033,300			
	Grand total, construction, general			800,471,000 (819,486,000)	19,015,000	778,407,700 (798,282,700)	19,875,000	827,528,000 (849,856,000)	22,328,000

[1] Amount shown is costs incurred for preauthorization studies only.
[2] Based on new cost-sharing formula provided for in the 1962 authorization act, Public Law 87-874.
[3] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.
[4] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small projects not requiring specific legislation.
[5] Includes $170,000 in S. Doc. 45, 88th Cong., 1st sess.

NOTE.—Projects shown in italic are new projects or modifications of projects on which construction has not started, and projects in bold face are those projects to be completed with the amount in the approved budget estimate.

Recommendations subsequently made to reprogram the budget amounts as follows:

State and project	From—	To—
Construction, general:		
Advance engineerng and design:		
Illinois: Richland Creek	0	$100,000
Kentucky:		
Carr Fork Reservoir	$100,000	150,000
Cave Run Reservoir	150,000	220,000
Cumberland	0	40,000
Red River Reservoir	0	50,000
Ohio:		
Fremont	0	100,000
North Branch Kokosing Reservoir	0	75,000
Salt Creek Reservoir	0	100,000
Pennsylvania: Blanchard Reservoir	488,000	428,000
Texas:		
Lavon Reservoir (modification)	0	150,000
Wallisville Reservoir	0	200,000
West Virginia: Justice Reservoir	150,000	300,000
Construction:		
California:		
Lower San Joaquin River	1,260,000	610,000
Marina Del Rey Harbor	0	1,350,000
Redondo Beach King Harbor	0	950,000
Russian River Basin	1,085,000	335,000
Sacramento River major and minor tributaries	1,800,000	1,500,000
Hawaii: Wailoa Stream	1,013,000	766,000
Illinois:		
Calument River bridges	2,000,000	1,400,000
Clear Creek Drainage and Levee Distriet	380,000	0
Kentucky:		
Barren River Reservoir	7,517,000	7,067,000
Fishtrap Reservoir	8,250,000	9,500,000
Minnesota: Marshall	810,000	696,000
New York: Rochester Harbor	1,250,000	1,025,000
Ohio: Ashtabula Harbor	553,000	383,000
Texas: Proctor Reservoir	3,045,000	2,000,000
Virginia: North Fork of Pound Reservoir	1,600,000	2,100,000
Washington: Colfax	1,150,000	600,000
West Virginia: Summersville	10,000,000	10,900,000
Wisconsin: Eau Galle River	400,000	200.000
Small authorized projects	2,000,000	2,128,000
Rehabilitation (major): New Jersey Intercoastal Waterway, N.J	422,000	0
Total	45,423,000	45,423,000

In accordance with H. Doc. 128, dated June 24, 1963, recommended budget amendment as follows:

State and project	Construction appropriations	
	Transfers to projects	Transfers from projects
Increases:		
Advance engineering and design	None	None
Construction:		
California: Santa Cruz Harbor, sand bypassing plant	0	$100,000
Florida: Cross-Florida Barge Canal	0	1,000,000
Texas: Brazos Island Harbor (1960 act)	0	800,000
Total, increases	0	1,900,000

Oroville Reservoir, Calif.

In approving the House allowance for the Oroville Reservoir, the committee has taken no position relative to the proper interest rate the State should be paid in this case.

During the hearings next year, the committee will expect the corps to present the basis for the existing contract with the State of California providing for an interest payment of 3½ percent for the flood-control features of the project.

Pending action by the committee next year, the corps should not reimburse the State of California for interest payments in excess of the actual rate paid by the State, or the going rate of interest on the long-term borrowings of the Federal Government, whichever is less. In addition, the committee desires that the corps refrain from entering into any further contracts involving interest payments by the Federal Government in excess of the going rate of interest on its long-term borrowings.

Central and Southern Florida Project

The committee has recommended $15,500,000, an increase of $1,500,000 over the budget amount and the amount allowed by the House. The budget amount will permit only the continuation of work on existing units and will not permit the initiation of any new features of the overall project for central and southern Florida. It is the desire of the committee that out of the $1,500,000 increase recommended, the Corps of Engineers initiate construction on Canal 111 below Homestead. This canal as now designed will provide not only flood protection and water control to a large area, but will also serve as a navigation vehicle for Aerojet General Corp. to enable transport into and out of its manufacturing facility which has a contract to produce large solid-fuel rocket engines that cannot be transported by other means. The construction of that canal will enable the company to gain access to the Intracoastal Waterway for shipment to the Atlantic Missile Test Center at Cape Kennedy.

Victory Dam and Reservoir, Vt.—Restudy

In order to assure that the recreation potential of Victory Dam and Reservoir project area, Vermont, be given the fullest consideration the committee directs the Corps of Engineers to obtain the cooperation and participation of other Federal agencies where feasible in the restudy of the project.

Justice Reservoir, W. Va.

The committee has allowed $300,000 for advance planning on the Justice Reservoir project. This allowance recognizes obligations to date in excess of $180,000 and the fact that further planning must cease on the project if additional funds are not forthcoming. Such lack of funds will delay the project and subject Logan and downstream locations to a longer period of devastating floods.

The committee has gone into the opposition raised by the railroad and by the coal and gas interests very extensively. During the hearings the committee requested that after the corps had completed its plans for the relocation of the Robinson-Phillips facility and developed

a plan for the continuation of operation of the Marianna mine, and had prepared a detailed plan for railroad relocations, the detailed plans be discussed with the owners affected.

The committee concurs in the view of the House committee that it would be advisable to hold a public hearing in the locality after the details of the land requirements and relocations are known. By that time the corps will have reevaluated the effect of the Justice Reservoir on the mineral resources of the area.

In view of the controversy which has arisen with respect to the project, the committee feels that at the time of the public hearing the corps should go into the feasibility of alternate plans of protection involving channel improvements and/or upstream detention reservoirs. The committee is aware that both in the corps survey report and in subsequent studies made at the direction of this committee a great deal of information along this line has been prepared and it concurs in the views of the House that any additional funds which the corps may need to complete or round out those studies should be taken from the funds provided in this bill.

In connection with its further planning of the project for recreational purposes the corps should endeavor to locate its recreation facilities in areas that will not hamper the recovery of minable coal in the area.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Appropriation, 1963	$145, 850, 350
Budget estimate, 1964	157, 368, 000
House allowance	150, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	157, 368, 000

The committee recommends $157,368,000, which is the budget amount and $7,368,000 over the House allowance.

During and after World War II, maintenance of completed projects was curtailed with the result that there was built up an accumulation of deferred maintenance well in excess of $120 million. This committee undertook to provide funds for the orderly reduction of that backlog. We are now nearing the completion of the program of eliminating the backlog. The committee feels that the projects which have been built should be properly maintained so as to perform the job for which they were built and that it would be unwise to defer needed maintenance at this time.

The details of the committee's recommendations are shown in the following table:

Operation and maintenance, fiscal year 1964

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Amount recommended by committee
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL			
1. Navigation:			
a Channels and harbors	$81,292,000	$81,292,000	$81,292,000
b Locks, dams, and canals	28,337,000	28,337,000	28,337,000
2. Flood control:			
a Reservoirs	10,020,000	10,020,000	10,020,000
b Channel improvements, inspections, and miscellaneous maintenance	1,203,000	1,203,000	1,203,000
3. Multiple-purpose projects including power	25,110,000	25,110,000	25,110,000
4. Protection of navigation	5,480,000	5,480,000	5,480,000
5. Emergency flood control activities	5,700,000	5,700,000	5,700,000
6. Niagara remedial works	75,000	75,000	75,000
7. National emergency activities	151,000	151,000	151,000
House reduction		−7,368,000	
Total, operation and maintenance, general	157,368,000	150,000,000	157,368,000

GENERAL EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$14,165,200
Budget estimate, 1964	15,252,000
House allowance	15,000,000
Committee recommendation	15,000,000

The committee recommends $15 million, the amount allowed by the House and $252,000 below the budget estimate.

The details of the committee's recommendation are shown in the following table:

General expenses, fiscal year 1964

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Amount recommended by committee
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
GENERAL EXPENSES			
1. Executive direction and management:			
(*a*) Office, Chief of Engineers	$5,307,000	$5,307,000	$5,307,000
(*b*) Division offices	8,022,000	8,022,000	8,022,000
Subtotal, executive direction and management	13,329,000	13,329,000	13,329,000
2. Review boards:			
(*a*) River and Harbor Board	551,000	551,000	551,000
(*b*) U.S. Coastal Engineering Research Center	200,000	200,000	200,000
Subtotal, review boards	751,000	751,000	751,000
3. Commercial statistics	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
4. Special investigations	172,000	172,000	172,000
Total, general expense	15,252,000	15,252,000	15,252,000
House reduction		−252,000	−252,000
Total		15,000,000	15,000,000

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Appropriation, 1963	$73, 504, 000
Budget estimate, 1964	74, 860, 000
House allowance	74, 500, 000
Committee recommendation	80, 406, 000

The committee recommends $80,406,000, an increase of $5,906,000 over the House and $5,546,000 over the budget estimate.

The details of the committee's recommendation are shown on the following table:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1964

Projects	Total estimated Federal cost	Amount appropriated to date	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Amount recommended by committee	
			Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys		$1,968,000	$25,000		$25,000		$25,000	
(b) Collection and study of basic data		605,000	85,000		85,000		85,000	
Subtotal, general investigations		2,573,000	110,000		110,000		110,000	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees	$233,000,000	204,631,000	2,580,000		2,580,000		2,800,000	
Channel improvement	683,000,000	483,278,000	26,500,000		26,500,000		28,000,000	
Memphis Harbor	18,300,000	15,936,000	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Baton Rouge Harbor	3,080,000	703,000						
Old River control	67,100,000	59,339,000	1,225,000		1,225,000		1,225,000	
St. Francis Basin	105,000,000	48,961,000	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower White River	12,900,000	10,987,000	850,000		850,000		850,000	
Cache River	25,300,000	105,000	50,000				50,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	9,390,000	1,520,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wolf River and tributaries [1]	1,500,000	1,105,000	395,000		395,000		395,000	
Lower Arkansas	25,200,000	21,505,000	400,000		400,000		400,000	
Tensas Basin: Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	37,200,000	20,624,000	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir	12,110,000	11,862,000	58,000		58,000		58,000	
Enid Reservoir	15,380,000	15,195,000	56,000		56,000		56,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	12,910,000	12,060,000	49,000		49,000		49,000	
Grenada Reservoir	31,630,000	31,460,000	37,000		37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	4,870,000	3,201,000	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Main stem	21,809,000	11,842,000	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
Tributaries	29,200,000	7,266,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	16,100,000	7,778,000	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
Yazoo backwater	29,000,000	1,918,000	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries	5,660,000	3,386,000	50,000		50,000		50,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	180,000,000	115,002,000	7,000,000		7,000,000		8,000,000	
Lake Pontchartrain	6,510,000	5,194,000					182,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning			54,250,000		54,200,000		57,152,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages			−1,500,000		−1,810,000		−1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning			52,750,000		52,390,000		55,652,000	
3. Maintenance			22,000,000		22,000,000		24,644,000	
4. Flood control emergencies								
Grand total			74,860,000		74,500,000		80,406,000	

[1] Complete with amount in approved budget.

U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers

Appropriation, 1963	$20,000
Budget estimate, 1964	-------
House allowance	-------
Committee recommendation	10,000

During the hearing the committee was informed that at the time the budget request for fiscal year 1964 was prepared it had been expected that the Joint Board could discharge its responsibilities before the end of the fiscal year and terminate its activities. The committee was further informed that subsequent developments made it impossible for the Board to complete all of its work during fiscal year 1963.

The committee, therefore, recommends the sum of $10,000 which will permit the Board to prepare its final report to the President, and complete miscellaneous activities, including retirement of records prior to terminating its activities.

All expenditures under this appropriation are reimbursed to the Treasury by the Power Authority of the State of New York.

Panama Canal

CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$23,405,650
Budget estimate, 1964	26,465,000
House allowance	25,000,000
Committee recommendation	25,725,000

The increase recommended in the budget includes the second increment of a three-step wage increase of area wage rates to bring them in line with wages based on U.S. rates. Another reason for the increase in operating expenses is the explosion of the school population in the Canal Zone. Other increases in the operating expenses of the Canal Zone Government are due to increases for medical care, postal service, and police protection.

While funds for the Canal Zone Government are appropriated, the Treasury is reimbursed for the net cost of the Canal Zone Government by the Panama Canal Company. School and hospital facilities are furnished the military and their dependents on a reimbursable basis.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Appropriation, 1963	$3,120,000
Budget estimate, 1964	7,250,000
House allowance	6,500,000
Committee recommendation	7,250,000

The full budget request is required in fiscal year 1964 for obligational authority, even though all of the funds will not be expended in fiscal year 1964.

Panama Canal Company

LIMITATION ON GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

The committee has restored $285,000 of the $550,000 reduction made by the House in the limitation on general administrative expenses for the Panama Canal Company. The committee believes that a reduction below this level would require uneconomical cutbacks in going programs.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Budget estimates in the amount of $455,285,000 were considered by the committee for the activities and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration. The committee recommends an appropriation of $420,290,200 for these purposes. This is $8,580,500 over the House allowance of $411,709,700; $16,661,900 more than the fiscal year 1963 appropriations of $403,628,300; and $34,994,800 under the budget estimates.

The committee's recommendations with regard to each appropriation request are set forth under individual headings in this report.

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Appropriation, 1963	$8,632,750
Budget estimate, 1964	11,361,000
House allowance	9,894,000
Committee recommendation	10,442,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $10,442,000 for the general investigations program of the Bureau of Reclamation. This is an increase of $548,000 over the allowance of the House, and $919,000 under the budget estimate.

Of the $548,000 which the Department asked to be added to the amount approved by the House of Representatives the committee has approved $448,000. The $100,000 reduction is in the amount requested for basin surveys.

In addition to the matters included in the budget justification, the committee recommends the following:

Monte Vista, Colo., office, $20,000.—The committee recommends an increase of $20,000 to continue the Monte Vista office of the Bureau of Reclamation through fiscal year 1964 while various investigation reports are under study.

Upper Star Valley project, Wyoming, $30,000.—The committee recommends an increase of $30,000 in the amount ($16,200) programed for the Upper Star Valley project investigation. This will permit completion of the feasibility report.

Weather modification, $50,000.—The committee recommends an increase of $50,000 for a study of scientific findings and recommendations on coordination of future research by the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology at Rapid City, S. Dak.

Colorado River diversion projects.—The committee recommends that within available funds $25,000 be utilized for expanding the study of Colorado River diversion projects to include the five northern counties of the State of Arizona, for which the State has contributed $50,000.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

	Budget program	New obligational authority
Appropriation, 1963	$172,767,639	$163,518,000
Budget estimate, 1964	211,111,300	195,760,000
House allowance	205,896,000	180,190,000
Committee recommendation	208,746,000	187,425,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $187,425,000 to finance a construction program of $208,746,000. The budget estimate of $195,760,000 is based on an undistributed reduction because of anticipated delays of $15,351,300; the committee recommendation is based on an undistributed reduction of $21,176,000; and the House allowance of $180,190,000 includes an undistributed reduction of $25,706,000.

The committee's recommended program of construction and rehabilitation is shown in the following table:

Project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Advance planning	$692,000	$692,000	$692,000
Gila project, Arizona	2,855,000	2,855,000	2,855,000
Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California	4,350,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	973,000	973,000	973,000
Central Valley project, California	50,445,000	48,295,000	48,295,000
Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Rio Grande project, recreational facilities, New Mexico	460,000	300,000	300,000
Arbuckle project, Oklahoma	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Norman project, Oklahoma	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg	300,000	300,000	300,000
The Dalles project, Western division, Oregon	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon	642,000	642,000	642,000
Canadian River project, Texas	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	11,309,000	11,309,000	11,309,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	3,900,000	3,900,000	4,950,000
Spokane Valley project, Washington	600,000	600,000	600,000
Drainage and minor construction	2,432,000	2,432,000	2,432,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,943,000	3,943,000	3,943,000
Denver office computer	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Reclamation office building			800,000
Subtotal	129,176,000	127,066,000	128,916,000
Missouri River Basin project:			
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
Almena unit, Kansas	5,580,000	3,983,000	4,403,000
East Bench unit, Montana	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,787,000	1,787,000	1,787,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota	365,000	365,000	365,000
Transmission division	23,956,000	23,000,000	23,275,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Drainage and minor construction	2,258,000	2,258,000	2,258,000
Investigations	1,824,000	1,557,000	1,717,000
Advance planning	1,343,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Suhtotal, Missouri River Basin project	78,613,000	75,650,000	76,505,000
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,322,300	3,180,000	3,180,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	81,935,300	78,830,000	79,685,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	211,111,300	205,896,000	208,601,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−15,351,300	−25,706,000	−21,176,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000

Colorado River front and levee system, $200,000.—The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in the allowance of $200,000 in addition to the budget program of $4,350,000 for the Colorado River front and levee system. A plan for recovery and utilization of ground water underlying the Valley division of the Yuma project has been formulated. This sum is needed for preconstruction planning

and gathering of final design data of a system to make use of this additional source of water.

The committee notes that the Legislatures of the States of Arizona and California have agreed upon a boundary between the two States. Now that agreement has been reached, the Commissioner of Reclamation is in a position to initiate the river dredging activity at Cibola, and funds provided herein are for moving the dredge from Needles to Cibola and establishing and equipping the dredge harbor yard at Cibola.

Central Valley project.—Trinity River division: There are programed $2,815,278 for irrigation development in the Trinity River division, Central Valley project. Inasmuch as a repayment contract has now been entered into with the Clear Creek Community Services District the committee recommends that this sum be used for initiating construction on both the Cow Creek unit and the Clear Creek South unit.

San Luis unit: The committee recommendation includes $287,000 programed for surveys, studies, designs, and specifications of transmission facilities for the San Luis unit. The committee is aware, however, of the offer of a firm 50-year contract to furnish electric transmission and distribution service for all Federal power operations in this unit at less than the cost to the Federal Government of constructing and operating Government facilities for such service. If study of this offer shows that it would result in lower costs to the United States, the Secretary is urged to enter into an appropriate wheeling arrangement.

The committee recommends the use of available funds for preconstruction work in connection with the proposed water distribution system for the Westlands Water District, including reimbursement to the district for such preconstruction work it has undertaken or undertakes, under terms and conditions satisfactory to the Secretary.

Pacific coast intertie, $2 million.—The committee recommends an appropriation of $2 million for land acquisition, engineering, design, and initiation of construction of extra-high-voltage direct-current transmission lines for the interconnection of the Central Valley project (Tracy, Calif.) power system, the Federal Colorado River power system (Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams powerplants, Colorado River storage project, and future Bridge and Marble Canyon powerplants), and the Bonneville Power Administration's power system on the Columbia River.

The requirements and restrictions set forth by the committee as applicable to the extra-high-voltage interconnection for which funds are recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration (p. 39) shall govern use of these funds.

Columbia Basin project, $1,050,000.—The committee recommends an additional $1,050,000 for the Columbia Basin project. This will provide $4,950,000 for work on this project in fiscal year 1964. The additional funds will provide $800,000 for initiation of construction of irrigation facilities on block 81, and $250,000 for deferred and supplemental construction on lands now under irrigation. For drainage construction $400,000 has been provided by directing that the programed amount for operation and maintenance be increased by this sum to be made available by readjustment within the overall program for "Oper-

ation and maintenance." Repayment contracts have now been executed with all the irrigation districts within the project.

Denver office building, $800,000.—The committee recommends an appropriation of $800,000 for an office building to house the engineering activities of the Bureau of Reclamation at Denver. At the present time these activities are carried on in a converted factory building erected during World War II. Facilities are completely unsatisfactory and inadequate from standpoints of space and space arrangement, economy of operation, and adequacy of utility systems. Proposed plans for renovation of the present building do not meet requirements of the highly specialized and permanent engineering staff of the Bureau. It is estimated that a new building on an area adjacent to the Bureau laboratory in the Denver Federal Center will cost $7 million. During the ensuing year, $350,000 is needed for architectural-engineering services and for preparation of plans and specifications. The remaining $450,000 will be used for award of a construction contract and initial contractor earnings.

Missouri River Basin project.—Almena unit: The committee recommends $4,403,000 for the Almena unit, $420,000 more than allowed by the House of Representatives. This will permit start of construction on the irrigation features of the project for which the House provided no funds. Completion of these features is necessary to permit use of the conservation storage provided in the Norton Dam Reservoir, and to avoid complete losses to farmers who have incurred expenses in expectation of available irrigation facilities.

Transmission division: It is proposed by the committee that $275,000 be added to the budget for relocation of the Fort Peck-Great Falls high voltage transmission line at Glasgow, Mont. A residential area has developed into the right-of-way for this line which has created a very hazardous situation. In the interest of safeguarding against loss of life and property the line must be placed on a new routing.

The committee concurs with the House of Representatives in deletion of $305,000 from the program for the Lusk-Osage segment of the Glendo-Lusk-Osage 115-kilovolt transmission line and substations. A suitable contract proposed by the Department of the Interior to provide wheeling service to the cooperative power entities for which the line is needed has been agreed to by the privately owned power company.

Investigations.—The committee recommends an additional appropriation of $160,000 for investigations in the Missouri River Basin project. Included in this amount are the sums of $20,000 for investigations of the Little White River project; $15,000 for investigations to determine the feasibility of establishing certain areas of the Fort Randall Conservancy Subdistrict as a separate unit of the Missouri River Basin project; $25,000 to initiate a feasibility study of the Mott unit, Cannonball division; and $100,000 for preauthorization investigations of the Nebraska Mid-State project.

The committee recommends that within available funds an additional $50,000 be provided for initiation of a feasibility study of the Pollock-Herreid irrigation unit; $25,000 be utilized for completion of the investigation of the Pembina unit, Garrison division; $35,000 be used to initiate a feasibility study of the Polecat Bench area, Wyoming; and $35,000 be made available for detailed feasibility studies of the Lower Musselshell River unit.

The program recommended for the Mirage Flats unit is $56,000, a reduction of $67,000 in the budget program. The House of Representatives has also made this reduction. This action was taken in accordance with a departmental recommendation made in view of a change in local interest. The amount recommended is required for investigating means of providing a supplemental water supply to land now being irrigated.

Advance planning.—The committee directs that within the amount programed for advance planning, $50,000 be made available to study the possibility of developing lands in the vicinity of Rydal Township and Belleville, Kans., as an irrigation unit to utilize water from Harlan County and Lowell Reservoirs.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$35, 845, 530
Budget estimate, 1964	38, 588, 000
House allowance	38, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	38, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $38 million for operation and maintenance of Bureau of Reclamation facilities. This sum is the same as the House allowance; and $588,000 less than the budget estimate.

Columbia Basin project.—As noted previously under "Construction and rehabilitation," the committee directs that within the amount made available for "Operation and maintenance," an additional $400,000 be utilized for drainage construction on the Columbia Basin project.

Gila project.—The committee approves enactment of language in the bill as it was passed by the House of Representatives which will permit transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association of $241,160, this being the accumulated reserve for depreciation and/or replacement of the Siphon Drop powerplant. The powerplant is now operated and maintained by the association. Provision is included to allow the Secretary of the Interior to lay down terms and conditions as to the custody, use, and expenditure of the reserve fund.

LOAN PROGRAM

Appropriation, 1963	$12, 217, 000
Budget estimate, 1964	13, 300, 000
House allowance	12, 217, 000
Committee recommendation	12, 367, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $12,367,000, which is $150,000 more than the House allowance, and $933,000 less than the budget estimate, for loans for the construction of irrigation distribution systems under Public Law 130, 84th Congress, and for construction, rehabilitation, and betterment of small reclamation projects under Public Law 984, 84th Congress.

The committee's recommended program is shown in the following table:

Project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Arvin-Edison Water Storage District, California	$3,342,000	$3,342,000	$3,342,000
Banta-Carbona Irrigation District, California	261,000	261,000	261,000
Cassia Creek Reservoir Co., Idaho	1,383,000	383,000	383,000
Eastern Municipal Water District, California	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Feather Water District, California	1,685,000	1,685,000	1,685,000
Georgetown Divide Public Utility District, California	204,839	204,839	204,839
Hooper Irrigation Co., Idaho			150,000
Jackson Valley Irrigation District, California	23,800	23,800	23,800
Molokai project, Hawaii	1,282,100	1,282,100	1,282,100
Roosevelt Irrigation District, Arizona	1,962,000	1,962,000	1,962,000
Settlement Canyon Irrigation District, Utah	817,000	817,000	817,000
South San Joaquin Irrigation District, California	975,000	975,000	975,000
Subtotal	13,235,739	12,235,739	12,385,739
Administration	124,409	124,409	124,409
Total fund requirement	13,360,148	12,360,148	12,510,148
Application of prior year funds	−60,148	−60,148	−60,148
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays and savings		−83,000	−83,000
Appropriation required for fiscal year 1964	13,300,000	12,217,000	12,367,000

Hooper Irrigation Co., Idaho, $150,000.—The committee recommends an appropriation of $150,000 for a loan to the Hooper Irrigation Co., Idaho, to be used for construction and rehabilitation of its irrigation facilities. The loan application in the amount of $1,163,000 was forwarded to the Congress, as required by law, on September 6, 1963. The Department has advised that during the remainder of this fiscal year the sum proposed is all that can be utilized effectively.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Appropriation, 1963	$111,808,000
Budget estimate, 1964	101,287,000
House allowance	97,845,700
Committee recommendation	97,989,200

The committee recommends an appropriation of $97,989,200. This is $143,500 more than the House allowance and $3,297,800 under the budget estimate.

The committee's recommended program is shown in the following table:

Project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
Upper Colorado River Basin Fund:			
Advance planning	$1,795,000	$1,473,700	$1,473,700
Construction:			
Colorado River storage project:			
Curecanti unit	18,822,000	18,822,000	18,822,000
Flaming Gorge unit	4,639,381	4,639,381	4,639,381
Glen Canyon unit	25,360,000	25,360,000	25,360,000
Transmission division	37,670,000	36,000,000	36,000,000
Participating projects:			
Emery County project, Utah	3,853,000	3,853,000	3,853,000
Florida project, Colorado	2,255,000	2,255,000	2,255,000
Lyman project, Wyoming-Utah	600,000	600,000	600,000
San Juan-Chama project, Colorado-New Mexico	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Seedskadee project, Wyoming	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Silt project, Colorado	500,000	500,000	500,000
Drainage and minor construction	64,619	64,619	64,619
Subtotal	103,159,000	101,167,700	101,167,700
Operation and maintenance	(1,893,200)	(1,893,200)	(1,893,200)
Recreational and fish and wildlife facilities:			
National Park Service	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,795,000
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	1,309,000	1,309,000	1,157,500
Subtotal	107,468,000	104,976,700	105,120,200
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−6,181,000	−7,131,000	−7,131,000
Total	101,287,000	97,845,700	97,989,200

Seedskadee project.—The committee concurs in the program of $6 million allowed by the House of Representatives for the Seedskadee participating project in Wyoming. Included in this amount is $230,000 needed for the establishment of a development farm for the purpose of determining as nearly as possible the type and size of farm which can be operated economically in this geographical area.

Recreation facilities.—The committee recommends an appropriation of $2,795,000 for recreation facilities under the provisions of section 8 of the Colorado River Storage Project Act. This will provide the full amount of the budget program except for Flaming Gorge National Recreational Area for which $808,400 is provided; Navajo Recreation Area for which $391,400 is recommended; and the Glen Canyon National Recreation Area for which the committee approves $1,243,300. The latter figure represents a reduction of $25,000 in the budget program, and is to be applied to the amount proposed for the administration building at Wahweap, Ariz. The $175,000 thus provided is for the building and required furnishings and equipment.

Fish and wildlife facilities, Curecanti unit, $302,000.—The amount proposed in the budget estimate for fish and wildlife facilities has been reduced by $151,500 which was to be for land acquisition. The Department advises, however, that this sum is not now necessary because a means has been worked out with the appropriate State agency to make better use, for game purposes, of land in the area already in public ownership.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$9,666,320
Budget estimate, 1964	10,051,000
House allowance	10,000,000
Committee recommendation	10,000,000

The committee recommends $10 million for general administrative expenses. This is the same as the House allowance, and $51,000 under the budget estimate.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Klamath project.—The committee recommends language in the bill which will make available not to exceed $140,000 of revenues derived from leasing of grazing and agricultural lands in the Klamath project for a study to determine water rights on the Klamath project. This is a procedure already authorized on some but not all divisions of the project.

Bonneville Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1963	$29, 800, 000
Budget estimate, 1964	56, 058, 000
House allowance	36, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	36, 204, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $36,204,000 for the construction program of the Bonneville Power Administration. This is $204,000 over the House allowance and $19,854,000 under the budget estimate.

After presentation of the 1964 budget, the committee was advised that funds would not be needed for the following construction projects programed to cost $2,690,000, and the committee has reduced the budget estimate by this amount.

Noxon-Hot Springs No. 2	$1, 660, 000
($290,000 of the proposed program of $1,950,000, is required during fiscal year 1964 for purchase of materials for the Hot Springs substation.)	
Blaine substation	275, 000
White River area service	500, 000
Pullman service	85, 000
Julietta service	80, 000
Orofino service	90, 000

In addition, the budget estimate is reduced by $500,000 proposed for preliminary engineering not related directly to the Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie; $16,500,000 of the $21,500,000 proposed for construction of this intertie; and $164,000 for 30 of the new positions requested.

The committee does recommend $250,000 for the Dorena substation in the Portland area.

Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnection, $6,500,000.—The committee recommends an appropriation of $5 million (for acquisition of land and acquisition and installation of equipment) and $1,500,000 (for preliminary engineering) to initiate construction of two extra-high-voltage transmission lines for the interconnection of the Bonneville Power Administration's system on the Columbia River, the Central Valley project power system at Tracy, Calif., and the Federal Colorado River power system (Hoover, Parker, and Davis Dams powerplants, Colorado River storage project, and future Bridge and Marble Canyon powerplants), at least one of which may be for transmission of direct current. One of them may connect with a non-Federal power system at the northern California border and be

terminated at that point. If it is determined that only one line shall be constructed at this time it shall be a direct current line to accomplish the interconnection of the Bonneville system, the Central Valley of California, and the Hoover Dam powerplant, the sale and exchange of Bonneville surplus power and energy and the sale and exchange of surplus power and energy between these areas. If it is determined that the direct current line be built entirely by the Federal Government, the portion inside the Bonneville primary service area shall be self-liquidating, as shall be the portion of the line outside the Bonneville Power Administration area.

The committee directs that construction of these lines not begin until there has been enacted into law S. 1007, or similar legislation guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. In addition, construction shall not begin unless the Secretary of the Interior finds, after good faith negotiations with utilities and other entities interested in constructing any portion of the lines involved, that their proposals will not result in benefits to the national interest at least equal to those to be derived from Federal construction, including revenues which will accrue to the Federal Government after amortization of the line or lines; has submitted his findings to the committee; and the committee has had an opportunity to review them.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$13, 126, 250
Budget estimate, 1964	13, 929, 000
House allowance	13, 200, 000
Committee recommendation	13, 500, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $13,500,000, an amount $429,000 under the budget estimate, and $300,000 more than the House allowance.

Southeastern Power Administration

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$800, 000
Budget estimate, 1964	1, 000, 000
House allowance	1, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	1, 000, 000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1 million—the amount of the budget estimate and the House allowance—for marketing power and energy generated at Corps of Engineers hydroelectric plants in the southeastern area of the United States. The increase of $200,000 over the amount approved for the last fiscal year is attributable primarily to increases in purchase of energy and wheeling charges, costs of power disposal arrangements, and system operation and maintenance.

Southwestern Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Appropriation, 1963	$7,210,000
Budget estimate, 1964	3,520,000
House allowance	3,000,000
Committee recommendation	3,000,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $3 million for the construction activities of the Southwestern Power Administration. This is $520,000 less than the budget estimate and the same as the House allowance.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Appropriation, 1963	$1,479,450
Budget estimate, 1964	1,568,000
House allowance	1,500,000
Committee recommendation	1,500,000

The committee recommends an appropriation of $1,500,000, an amount $68,000 less than the budget estimate, for operation and maintenance, Southwestern Power Administration. This is the same as the House allowance.

CONTINUING FUND

(Indefinite appropriation of receipts)

Appropriation, 1963	$5,000,000
Budget estimate, 1964	4,500,000
House allowance	4,500,000
Committee recommendation	4,500,000

The committee concurs with the House in recommending appropriation of the budget estimate of $4,500,000 for the purchase of power and rental of transmission facilities. The funds are derived from receipts from the sale of power and energy.

The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration; or to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration. The Administration should give preference in the sale of power and energy to public bodies and cooperatives, as provided by law; but it should not participate directly or indirectly in the construction of power-producing facilities, nor should it encourage the construction of generating facilities or transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available or will be made available within a reasonable time at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

GENERAL STATEMENT

The amount of increase recommended by the committee of $100,050,000 consists of restorations for operating expenses of $61,355,000 and for plant and capital equipment of $38,695,000. Appropriations for the two items total $2,788,219,000, which is $61,426,000 under the revised estimates for the two items of $2,849,645,000.

Recommendations for the activities of the Commission are detailed in the following paragraphs:

OPERATING EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$2, 352, 001, 000
Estimate, 1964 (including amendment in H. Doc. 105)	2, 423, 500, 000
House allowance	2, 308, 169, 000
Committee recommendation	2, 369, 524, 000

NOTE.—In addition, applied revenues of $32,000,000 are available.

Restorations of $61,355,000 are recommended by the committee, as explained in detail and summarized in the following table:

Operating expenses

Program	Budget estimate, 1964	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation	Change proposed
Raw materials	$324,843,000	$320,000,000	$320,000,000	0
Special nuclear materials	480,471,000	475,000,000	475,000,000	0
Weapons	782,969,000	782,969,000	782,969,000	0
Reactor development	530,548,000	497,000,000	515,500,000	+$18,500,000
Physical research	219,077,000	192,137,000	204,137,000	+12,000,000
Biology and medicine	76,973,000	68,645,000	75,645,000	+7,000,000
Training, education, and information	17,194,000	14,350,000	15,850,000	+1,500,000
Isotopes development program	9,260,000	7,860,000	8,360,000	+500,000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	15,100,000	10,000,000	13,500,000	+3,500,000
Community program	10,081,000	10,081,000	10,081,000	0
Program direction and administration	73,415,000	71,560,000	72,915,000	+1,355,000
Security investigation program	6,950,000	6,950,000	6,950,000	0
Cost of work for others	6,240,000	6,240,000	6,240,000	0
Change in selected resources	53,252,000	28,250,000	45,250,000	+17,000,000
Revenues and reimbursements from non-Federal sources	−32,000,000	−32,000,000	−32,000,000	0
Unobligated balance brought forward	−150,873,000	−150,873,000	−150,873,000	0
Total	2,423,500,000	2,308,169,000	2,369,524,000	+61,355,000

Reactor development program.—The committee recommends an appropriation of $515,500,000 for this program, which is $18,500,000 over the House allowance and $15, 048,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee supports the addition of $3,500,000 recommended by the House to be applied to the development work on the "seed and blanket" concept of the civilian power reactor program, and restoration in that amount is recommended to assure that funds are available for that purpose.

Also included in the restoration is $3 million in operating costs for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. In restoring these funds, it is not the intention of the committee that such funds would

be used for arrangements under which additional light water reactors of already proven types would be constructed. On the contrary, the intention of the committee by this restoration, together with $12 million of funds budgeted under the "selected resources" program of the Commission, is to provide an availability of $15 million for the purpose of entering into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types. The committee believes that this very important program must be permitted to continue, to enable private industry to play a role in developing atomic power. Government assistance, to the extent of 10 percent or less of the cost of a plant, has permitted reactors to be built with a minimum of Government funds. Without this program, it might be necessary for the Government to bear the entire cost of constructing new reactor plants of advanced types. In this connection, the committee is advised that competitive nuclear power, in any area of the country, is an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time.

The balance of the restoration recommended, $12 million, is for the purpose of avoiding curtailment of the planned progress of such important activities as the development of nuclear rockets for space propulsion, the development of auxiliary power for satellites, and research in the field of nuclear safety.

Physical research program.—Restoration of $12 million is recommended by the committee for this program, to provide an appropriation of $204,137,000, which is $15,940,000 under the budget estimate.

Of the restoration recommended, $2 million is to be applied against the House reduction of $3,750,000 for controlled thermonuclear research, to allow $22 million for this activity. The Commission advised the committee that it is premature at this time to select research concepts which can be terminated, due to the fact that significant progress is being made in this activity.

The balance of the restoration recommended, $10 million, is for distribution to other activities of the physical research program. The committee does not agree with continuing increases for the high energy physics activities if it can only be done at the sacrifice of other portions of the physical research program that it considers just as important.

Biology and medicine program.—The committee recommends restoration of $7 million, to provide a total amount of $75,645,000 for this program, which is $1,328,000 below the budget estimate. The committee believes that it is most important to learn all we can as to the effects of radiation on man and his environment since it has already been well demonstrated that many benefits to mankind are dependent upon this knowledge.

Training, education, and information.—Restoration of $1,500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $15,850,000 for training, education, and information, which is $1,344,000 below the budget estimate. The committee believes it is important to assure that funds are available to prepare for the Third Geneva Conference, but is not convinced of the need to provide increased funds for the continued training of foreign nationals.

Isotopes development program.—The committee recommends restoration of $500,000, to provide a total amount of $8,360,000 for this program, which is $900,000 below the budget estimate.

Civilian applications of nuclear explosives.—The committee recommends restoration of $3,500,000, to provide a total amount of $13,500,000 for the program, which is $1,600,000 under the budget estimate.

The committee recognizes the need to continue research on and development of nuclear devices to hasten the day when this technology can be used for peaceful purposes. The committee understands that the research results so far have been encouraging, and therefore believes the program should be supported at a reasonable level.

Program direction and administration.—Restoration of $1,355,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of $72,915,000 for program direction and administration, which is $500,000 below the budget estimate. The committee is advised that the 73 positions thus restored are required by the Commission, due to additional responsibilities under the test ban treaty concerning safeguards, as well as assuring that the interests of the Government are fully protected in the increasingly complex research and development programs.

Change in selected resources.—The committee recommends restoration of $17 million, to provide a total amount of $45,250,000 for this item, which is $8,002,000 under the budget estimate. Of this amount, $12 million represents obligational authority for the civilian nuclear power cooperative program, to conform to the restoration of $3 million in the reactor development program; and $5 million represents obligations related to program costs restored in other programs of the Commission.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Appropriation, 1963	$262, 745, 000
Estimate, 1964 (including budget amendment in H. Doc. 166)	426, 145, 000
House allowance	380, 000, 000
Committee recommendation	418, 695, 000

NOTE.—In addition, an unobligated balance of $6,300,000 is available.

Restoration of $38,695,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount for plant and capital equipment of $418,695,000, which is $7,450,000 below the budget estimate.

The items restored are as follows:

12 weapons construction projects approved by supplemental authorization in connection with safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty	$17, 945, 000
Community building portion of Los Alamos community disposal project	750, 000
Restoration of a portion of general reduction of $27,200,000 for slippage on all other capital plant and equipment	20, 000, 000
Total restoration	38, 695, 000

The supplemental authorization for the weapons projects has been passed by both Houses of the Congress since the bill was reported from the House.

The committee believes the estimate for the community building portion of Los Alamos community disposal project is reasonable in that this building will house activities related to the county administration as well as the municipal functions at Los Alamos. The committee is advised that the community is making good progress in assuming

the responsibilities of self-government, and believes that such progress should not be slowed down through delay in providing this building.

The committee does agree that slippage in the amount of $7,200,000 should be absorbed by the Commission after providing for general plant requirements at all Commission sites for needed building replacements and modifications. The committee believes that any further reduction may cause delays in getting projects started if adequate funds are not available, since the funds are earmarked for specific projects.

St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Limitation, 1963	$424,450
Budget estimate, 1964	429,000
House allowance	429,000
Committee recommendation	429,000

An administrative expenses limitation of $429,000 is recommended. This is the amount of the House allowance and the budget estimate.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Appropriation, 1963	$35,071,000
Estimate, 1964 (including amendment in H. Doc. 125)	48,284,000
House allowance	46,000,000
Committee recommendation	48,284,000

Restoration of $2,284,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of $48,284,000 for the appropriation to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The committee is advised that most of the construction has been programed for later in the fiscal year and that any delays occasioned by lack of funds would add to the cost of the projects.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Appropriation, 1963	$33,610
Budget estimate, 1964	39,000
House allowance	38,000
Committee recommendation	38,000

The committee recommends $38,000, the amount allowed by the House.

Funds appropriated under this head are for salaries and expenses of the U.S. member of the commission and his staff. The commission was created by compact among the States of Delaware, New Jersey, and New York, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the Federal Government to participate jointly in the conservation, utilization, development, and control of water and related land resources in the Delaware River Basin.

CONTRIBUTION TO DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

Appropriation, 1963	$80,000
Budget estimate, 1964	117,000
House allowance	117,000
Committee recommendation	117,000

The committee recommends $117,000, the budget estimate and the amount allowed by the House. These funds are required to cover the U.S. share of the operating expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission.

TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Public Works Acceleration

Appropriation, 1963	$850,000,000
Budget estimate, 1964	45,000,000
House allowance	None
Committee recommendation	45,000,000

The budget estimate of $45 million contemplated the allocation of the funds requested to direct Federal projects as follows:

Department of Agriculture	$28,200,000
Department of the Interior	14,100,000
Administrative costs	2,700,000
Total	45,000,000

The projects of these agencies require very little leadtime and therefore the budget proposal contemplated concentration on direct Federal projects of these agencies since their effect on unemployment would be almost immediate. Similarly, projects of this type can be carried on throughout the winter months when other types of construction work cannot be performed.

In approving the budget estimate the committee recommends that half of the funds be allocated for projects of the Community Facilities Administration, where the Federal funds are augmented by the utilization of local funds for the construction of urgently needed community facilities. The committee notes that there is a very large backlog of applications for such facilities awaiting approval.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF THE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1963 AND THE ESTIMATES FOR 1964

PERMANENT INDEFINITE APPROPRIATIONS

	Appropriation estimate, 1963	Appropriation estimate, 1964	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Department of the Army civil functions:			
Payments to States, Flood Control Act of 1954, Army	$1,828,000	$1,828,000	
Corps of Engineers—Civil special expense funds	172,000	172,000	
Total, Department of Army civil functions	2,000,000	2,000,000	
Bureau of Reclamation:			
Colorado River Dam fund, Boulder Canyon project:			
Payment of interest on advances from the Treasury	3,100,000	3,100,000	
Payments to States of Arizona and Nevada	600,000	600,000	
Construction of operation and maintenance headquarters and facilities, irrigation projects	3,000		−$3,000
Operation, maintenance, and replacement of project works, North Platte project (Gering and Fort Laramie, Goshen and Pathfinder Irrigation Districts)	4,000	4,000	
Payment to Farmer's Irrigation District (North Platte project, Nebraska-Wyoming)	8,000	8,000	
Refunds and returns	100,000	100,000	
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	3,815,000	3,812,000	−3,000
Total, permanent indefinite appropriations	5,815,000	5,812,000	−3,000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1963 AND THE ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1964

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Recommended in House bill, 1964	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964	House bill
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL							
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY							
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES							
Salaries and expenses	$10,333,000	$10,846,000	$10,800,000	$10,800,000	+$467,000	−$46,000	
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL							
General investigations	18,100,000	20,060,000	18,000,000	20,625,000	+2,525,000	+565,000	+$2,625,000
Construction, general	792,870,500	[1] 819,486,000	798,282,700	849,856,000	+56,985,500	+30,370,000	+51,573,300
Operation and maintenance, general	145,850,350	157,368,000	150,000,000	157,368,000	+11,517,650		+7,368,000
General expenses	14,165,200	15,252,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	+834,800	−252,000	
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	73,504,000	74,860,000	74,500,000	80,406,000	+6,902,000	+5,546,000	+5,906,000
U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers	20,000			10,000	−10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control	1,044,510,050	1,087,026,000	1,055,782,700	1,123,265,000	+78,754,950	+36,239,000	+67,482,300
THE PANAMA CANAL							
Canal Zone Government:							
Operating expenses	23,405,650	26,465,000	25,000,000	25,725,000	+2,319,350	−740,000	+725,000
Capital outlay	3,120,000	[2] 7,250,000	6,500,000	7,250,000	+4,130,000		+750,000
Panama Canal Company: *Limitation on general administrative expenses*	*(8,284,000)*	*(9,550,000)*	*(9,000,000)*	*(9,285,000)*	*(+1,001,000)*	*(−265,000)*	*(+285,000)*
Total, the Panama Canal	26,525,650	33,715,000	31,500,000	32,975,000	+6,449,350	−740,000	+1,475,000
Total, title I	1,081,368,700	1,131,587,000	1,098,082,700	1,167,040,000	+85,671,300	+35,453,000	+68,957,300

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR							
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION							
General investigations	[3] 8,632,750	11,361,000	9,894,000	10,442,000	+1,809,250	−919,000	+548,000
Construction and rehabilitation	[4] 163,518,000	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000	+23,907,000	−8,335,000	+7,235,000
Operation and maintenance	[5] 35,845,530	38,588,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	+2,154,470	−588,000	
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	*(3,525,000)*	*(4,363,000)*	*(4,363,000)*	*(4,363,000)*	*(+838,000)*		
Loan program	[4] 12,217,000	[6] 13,300,000	12,217,000	12,367,000	+150,000	−933,000	+150,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000				−1,000,000		
Upper Colorado River Basin fund	[4] 111,808,000	[7] 101,287,000	97,845,700	97,989,200	−13,818,800	−3,297,800	+143,500
General administrative expenses	[8] 9,666,320	10,051,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	+333,680	−51,000	
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	342,687,600	370,347,000	348,146,700	356,223,200	+13,535,600	−14,123,800	+8,076,500
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Construction	29,800,000	[9] 56,058,000	36,000,000	36,204,000	+6,404,000	−19,854,000	+204,000
Operation and maintenance	13,126,250	13,929,000	13,200,000	13,500,000	+373,750	−429,000	+300,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	42,926,250	69,987,000	49,200,000	49,704,000	+6,777,750	−20,283,000	+504,000
SOUTHERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Operation and maintenance	800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	+200,000		
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION							
Construction	7,210,000	3,520,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	−4,210,000	−520,000	
Operation and maintenance	1,479,450,	1,568,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	+20,550	−68,000	
Continuing fund (*indefinite appropriation of receipts*)	*(5,000,000)*	*(4,500,000)*	*(4,500,000)*	*(4,500,000)*	*(−500,000)*		
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	8,689,450	5,088,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	−4,189,450	−588,000	
Total, definite appropriations	395,103,300	446,422,000	402,846,700	411,427,200	+16,323,900	−34,994,800	+8,580,500
Total, indefinite appropriations	8,525,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	+338,000		
Total, title II	403,628,300	455,285,000	411,709,700	420,290,200	+16,661,900	−34,994,800	+8,580,500

See footnotes at end of table, p. 51.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1963 and the estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1964—Con.

REGULAR ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Recommended in House bill, 1964	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (−), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964	House bill
TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION							
Operating expenses	$2,872,224,000	[10] $2,423,500,000	$2,308,169,000	$2,369,524,000	−$502,700,000	−$53,976,000	+$61,355,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	*(29,000,000)*	*(32,000,000)*	*(32,000,000)*	*(32,000,000)*	*(+3,000,000)*		
Plant and capital equipment	262,745,000	[11] 426,145,000	380,000,000	418,695,000	+155,950,000	−7,450,000	+38,695,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	3,134,969,000	2,849,645,000	2,688,169,000	2,788,219,000	−346,750,000	−61,426,000	+100,050,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation:							
Limitation on administrative expense	*(424,450)*	*(429,000)*	*(429,000)*	*(429,000)*	*(+4,550)*		
Tennessee Valley Authority	35,071,000	[12] 48,284,000	46,000,000	48,284,000	+13,213,000		+2,284,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:							
Salaries and expenses	33,610	39,000	38,000	38,000	+4,390	−1,000	
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	80,000	117,000	117,000	117,000	+37,000		
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	113,610	156,000	155,000	155,000	+41,390	−1,000	

U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins	552,000				−552,000		
Total, definite appropriations	3,170,705,610	2,898,085,000	2,734,324,000	2,836,658,000	−334,047,610	−61,427,000	+102,334,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	29,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	+3,000,000		
Total, title III	3,199,705,610	2,930,085,000	2,766,324,000	2,868,658,000	−331,047,610	−61,427,000	+102,334,000
TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT							
Public works acceleration	[13] 850,000,000	[14] 45,000,000		45,000,000	−805,000,000		+45,000,000
Grand totals:							
Total, definite appropriations	5,497,177,610	4,521,094,000	4,235,253,400	4,460,125,200	−1,037,052,410	−60,968,800	+224,871,800
Total, indefinite appropriations	37,525,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	+3,338,000		
Grand total, all titles	5,534,702,610	4,561,957,000	4,276,116,400	4,500,988,200	−1,033,714,410	−60,968,800	+224,871,800

[1] Reflects increase of $1,900,000 in H. Doc. 128.
[2] Reflects increase of $250,000 in H. Doc. 134.
[3] Reflects transfer of $232,750 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[4] Reflects transfer of $300,000 from "Loan program" and $700,000 from "Construction and rehabilitation" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[5] Reflects transfer of $232,750 to "General investigations" and $366,320 to "General administrative expenses" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[6] Reflects $4,000,000 decrease in H. Doc. 89.
[7] Reflects $2,622,000 decrease in H. Doc. 109 and $500,000 increase in H. Doc. 125.
[8] Reflects transfer of $366,320 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[9] Reflects decrease of $4,860,000 in H. Doc. 125.
[10] Reflects decrease of $49,300,000 in H. Doc. 105.
[11] Reflects increase of $5,945,000 in H. Doc. 166.
[12] Reflects increase of $4,000,000 in H. Doc. 125.
[13] Includes $450,000,000 appropriated in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[14] Submitted in H. Doc. 173.

Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

[Report No. 746]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

NOVEMBER 20 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1963
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

DECEMBER 5, 1963
Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain civil functions admin-

istered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Cemeterial Expenses

salaries and expenses

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; $10,800,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of $17,000, but such limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as may be required to

provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further,* That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, ~~$18,000,000~~ *$20,625,000* to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $210,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be co-

ordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); ~~$798,282,700~~ *$849,856,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; and emergency flood control and shore protection activities; ~~$150,000,000~~ *$157,368,000*, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Beach Erosion Board; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; $15,000,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), ~~$74,500,000~~ *$80,406,000*, to remain available until expended.

UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: Provided, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in

the manners authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and eighty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

operating expenses

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of

indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; and payments of not to exceed $50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, ~~$25,000,000~~ *$25,725,000*.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, of which seven are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; ~~$6,500,000~~ *$7,250,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters for non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding $16,500.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and

borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

No real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

Not to exceed ~~$9,000,000~~ *$9,285,000* of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed ~~sixteen~~ *twenty-one* passenger motor vehicles *of which sixteen are* for replacement only, including one limousine at not to exceed ~~$6,300~~ *$7,800* and for uniforms or

allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding $30,000: *Provided,* That the rates for individuals shall not exceed $100 per diem.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, including not to exceed $400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to remain available until expended, ~~$9,894,000~~ *$10,442,000*, of which ~~$8,621,000~~ *$8,902,000* shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the

Colorado River development fund: *Provided,* That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further,* That ~~$340,000~~ *$388,000* of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, ~~$180,190,000~~ *$187,425,000,* of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary

to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, $38,000,000, of which $31,408,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $1,645,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided,* That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-

Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a-421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, ~~$12,217,000~~ *$12,367,000* to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, ~~$97,845,700~~ *$97,989,200*, of which $94,036,700 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and ~~$3,809,000~~ *$3,952,500* shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That

no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, $10,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative

Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461–467) : *Provided,* That no part of any

appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations".

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law: *Provided, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath*

Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath Project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2(c) of the Act of June 17, 1944, and Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided,* That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed $225,000 may be expended from the

appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

The amount of $241,160 shall be available from "Refunds and returns" for transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the amount of credits accumulated as a reserve for depreciation and/or replacement of Siphon Drop powerplant, Yuma project, Arizona-California; this sum to be transferred to the Yuma County Water Users Association only after a contract providing for the custody, use, or expenditure of said money and containing terms satisfactory to the Secretary has been entered into with said association.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, ~~$36,000,000~~ *$36,204,000*, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, ~~$13,200,000~~ *$13,500,000*.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Adminis-

tration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $1,000,000.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, $1,500,000.

CONTINUING FUND

Not to exceed $4,500,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy, and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided,* That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute

to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided,* That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; ~~$2,308,169,000~~ *$2,369,524,000,* and any moneys (except sums received from

disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant

and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase (not to exceed four hundred and twenty-three for replacement only, including two at not to exceed $3,000 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; ~~$380,000,000~~ *$418,695,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1963, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for "Operating expenses", for capital equipment not related to construction, shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1963, of the appropriation "Plant acquisition and construction" shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $30,000,000 for a spectral shift power reactor may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to carry out such cooperative power reactor demonstration program as may be authorized by law.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used

subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1964 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropirations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the fiscal year 1964 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that

reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed $429,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed $2,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day: *Provided,* That not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for services of individuals employed at rates in excess of $50 per day.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including purchase (one for replacement only) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed one hundred and ninety for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, ~~$46,000,000~~ *$48,284,000*, to remain available until expended.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), $38,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $117,000.

TITLE IV

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress.

TITLE ~~IV~~ *V*—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. ~~401~~ *501*. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal

year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $1,950.

SEC. ~~402~~ *502*. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon

conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

SEC. ~~403~~ *503*. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

SEC. ~~404~~ *504*. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which

he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. ~~405~~ *505*. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of $6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

SEC. ~~406~~ *506*. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise

specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,* That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. ~~407~~ *507*. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury.

SEC. ~~408~~ *508*. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

SEC. ~~409~~ *509*. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expendi-

ture by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964".

Passed the House of Representatives November 19, 1963.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

[Report No. 746]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

NOVEMBER 20 (legislative day, OCTOBER 22), 1963
Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

DECEMBER 5, 1963
Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS
OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Dec. 9, 1963
For actions of Dec. 6, 1963
88th-1st; No. 199

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....15
Administrative procedure.....4
Apportionment.....12
Appropriations.....7,14
CCC.....13
Congressional organization.....5
Conservation.....7
Copyrights.....6
Cotton.....8
Education.....22
Eggs.....9
Export control.....17
Feed grain.....7
Flood control.....20
Foreign aid.....10,16
Foreign currencies.....16
Foreign trade.....9,18,19
Forestry.....3
Guam.....1
Legislative program.....14
Lumber.....2
Meat imports.....21
Pay.....12
Personnel.....12
Stockpiling.....13
Transportation.....2
Vocational education.....11
Wheat.....18

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on foreign aid authorization bill. Senate passed bills to: Provide agricultural services to Guam; Permit foreign vessels to transport U.S. lumber to Puerto Rico. Sen. Talmadge urged enactment of Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill. Sen. Keating criticized increased Common Market tariff on U.S. eggs. Sen. Proxmire opposed proposed irrigation project on basis it would increase feed grain production.

SENATE

1. GUAM. Passed without amendment S. 692, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain an agricultural program on Guam as determined by him will promote the welfare of the island. p. 22520

2. LUMBER; TRANSPORTATION. Passed as reported S. 2100, to continue for two years, from Oct. 24, 1963, the temporary authority of the Secretary of Commerce to suspend the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act with respect to the transportation of lumber to Puerto Rico from any ports in the U. S. on foreign vessels whenever he determines that there is no domestic vessel reasonably available for transportation of the lumber. pp. 22569, 22571, 22573-8

3. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment S. 2218, to authorize the transfer of 360 acres of national forest land in Cocke County, Tenn., to the Department of the Interior for purposes of the Foothills Parkway. p. 22520

4. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE; LAW. Passed as reported S. 1466, to provide for the right of persons to be represented by attorneys in matters before Federal agencies. pp. 22568-9

5. CONGRESSIONAL ORGANIZATION. Continued debate on a motion to proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 1, to provide for the creation of a Joint Committee To Study the Organization and Operation of the Congress. pp. 22579-83, 22595-8

6. COPYRIGHTS. Passed without amendment S. 776, to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying. pp. 22522-7

7. APPROPRIATIONS. Sen. Proxmire submitted amendments intended to be proposed to H. R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill, to provide that no funds for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes, contended that the irrigated lands would increase feed grain production, and inserted various statistics on the production of feed grains and lands taken out of production under the conservation reserve program. pp. ~~22473~~, 22555-62

8. COTTON. Sen. Talmadge reviewed "the gravity of the cotton and textile problem," urged passage of the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill as "the most sensible and economical solution of this dilemma," and inserted several items in support of his position. pp. 22562-3

9. FOREIGN TRADE; EGGS. Sen Keating criticized the increase in import duties on dried and frozen egg products by the European Common Market, stated that it "will be most injurious to U.S. trade and that every effort must be made to reduce these levies," and inserted a letter from this Department reviewing the situation. pp. 22480-1

10. FOREIGN AID Sen. McGovern inserted an address by Eugene R. Black, former Director of the World Bank, reviewing the foreign aid program. pp. 22481-3

11. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Sen. Morse made a progress report on the status of the conference with the House on the vocational education bill and expressed his belief "the odds are apparently against our getting a vocational education bill." pp. 22477-8

12. PERSONNEL; PAY. Received the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on Federal employment and pay for Oct. pp. 22457-61

Sen. Yarborough announced that hearings will be held Dec. 11, on S. 14 and H. R. 10, to extend civil service apportionment requirements to temporary summer employment. p. 22473

13. STOCKPILING. Received the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures on Federal stockpile inventories as of Aug., including CCC commodity inventories. pp. 22461-70

14. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the public works appropriation bill and the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill will be considered Mon. p. 22578

15. ADJOURNED until Mon., Dec. 9. p. 22600

needed—stern justice. Without such justice our streets, and our families, will continue to be endangered.

Justice is not served when the innocent victim and society suffer while the vicious criminal goes free.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., observed: "At the present time in this country there is more danger that criminals will escape justice than that they will be subjected to tyranny."

Judge Learned Hand said: "Our dangers do not lie in too little tenderness to the accused. Our procedure has been always haunted by the ghost of the innocent man convicted. It is an unreal dream. What we need to fear is the archaic formalism and the watery sentiment that obstructs, delays, and defeats the prosecution of crime."

Justice Benjamin N. Cardozo observed: "Justice, though due to the accused, is due to the accuser also. The concept of fairness must not be strained till it is narrowed to a filament. We are to keep the balance true."

Let us proceed to try armed robbers as armed robbers. Let the punishment fit the crime and let us "keep the balance true."

Wherever politics and opportunism remain primary considerations in the appointment of jurists, parole officials, and others charged with the administration of justice, the public should have more adequate guarantees for the immediate removal of those who prove by their unjustifiable actions that they cannot be entrusted with the important responsibilities of their offices.

The fact is millions of free Americans are taking our good way of life for granted. They have ceased to care about our foundation stones, the "rock from which we were hewn."

Let us never forget that religion has made us what we are, given us what we have. Every good thing we enjoy as free Americans came directly or indirectly out of our belief in God.

Our best offensive against crime, subversion, intolerance and all enemies of America's heritage of freedom is brotherhood—a brotherhood such as yours, built upon a solid foundation of mutual trust, understanding and faith in God.

There must be a moral reawakening in every home in our land.

History shows us the great accomplishments that can be attained by the combined efforts of selfless men and women who are sincerely dedicated to a noble cause. We have such a cause in America—to dispel intolerance, to preserve the rule of law, to protect and strengthen our God-given ideals and faith in freedom.

Law and public sanctions help to keep our deeds in line—only conscience polices our thoughts. It is much easier to control our actions than our thoughts.

For, "As a man thinketh in his heart so is he."

Two hundred years ago, our Founding Fathers had a vision of a nation where men could live together and worship together without fear. Today, we hold this same vision—the determination that faith, courage and decency will prevail over all enemies of freedom.

Since 1753, when the Liberty Bell first tolled at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, it has borne a solemn Old Testament inscription from Leviticus xxv, verse 10: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

Let us all work together to maintain this great American ideal. With God's divine guidance, let us build an ever more powerful brotherhood of liberty and justice for the benefit of all mankind.

As the Father of our Country so aptly said—"As we declare our loyalty to our country, help us to keep in mind the need of faith in God and immortality without which life is meaningless and vain."

This is our mission as a nation of free people, united in one faith—faith in God.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—GLEN ELDER PROJECT—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 343 AND 344)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit two amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to House bill 9140, the public works appropriation bill, and ask that they be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these amendments be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 11, line 18, change $187.425,000 to $182,425,000 and on page 12, line 5, insert the following: *"Provided,* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Glen Elder unit in Kansas."

On page 12, line 5, add the following: ": *Provided further,* That no funds in this bill, for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, first I wish briefly to describe these amendments.

The first amendment would eliminate the $5 million to be appropriated under the bill for the so-called Glen Elder project. That is a dual-purpose project, one purpose being to provide flood control in the Kansas City area and the other purpose being to provide irrigation in the vicinity of Glen Elder, Kans., for Kansas farmers.

The first amendment would eliminate the entire project, so far as the appropriation is concerned, at this time.

The second amendment would provide that none of the funds for the project shall be spent for irrigation.

I shall address myself primarily to the second amendment today, though I shall discuss both amendments to some extent.

I wish to make some parliamentary inquiries, and I ask for the attention of the Parliamentarian.

I read the second amendment, which is very short.

On page 12, line 5, add the following: *Provided further,* That no funds in this bill for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes.

My parliamentary inquiry is whether or not the amendment is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment, when offered, will be in order.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. President, I honestly and frankly submit this amendment with great reluctance. Last year I spoke on the floor of the Senate on this particular project, and I made the longest speech any Senator made in the Senate last year. It was a 10-hour speech. I made it because I felt then that this was the most wasteful project I had ever seen, and I wanted to dramatize how wasteful these projects can be when conceived as this one has been conceived and when based on a totally unrealistic estimate of the discount ratio, which I shall explain in a moment, and of the life of the project, which I shall also explain shortly.

This project is particularly wasteful in view of the fact that the irrigation portion—$17 million of the $76 million project—would be for the prime purpose of bringing more feed grains into production. Thirteen thousand acres of additional land would be brought into the production of feed grains. If there is something which the country needs less than feed grains, I am not familiar with what it is.

We are now spending hundreds of millions of dollars to reduce the supply of feed grains. We are spending more than a billion dollars.

I have a table which shows the estimated total payments under the feed grain program for 1963 to each of the States in the Union; and almost every State including Rhode Island is included. I point out that unless my amendment passes the Public Works Appropriation bill will bring additional land into production of feed grains at a cost of millions of dollars, although Kansas is receiving $44 million for taking land out of the production of feed grains. The total payments in the Nation in 1963 will be $843,842,000 for taking land out of production.

I ask unanimous consent that the table showing the "Estimated Total Payment under the Feed Grain Program for 1963," listing amounts for each State now being expended by the Federal treasury to take land out of the production of feed grains, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated total payment under the feed grain program for 1963 [1]

[In thousands]

Alabama	$10,364
Arizona	3,242
Arkansas	2,805
California	10,186
Colorado	6,919
Connecticut	85
Delaware	1,479
Florida	3,230
Georgia	11,950
Idaho	1,699
Illinois	87,564
Indiana	53,693
Iowa	121,709
Kansas	44,375
Kentucky	18,378
Louisiana	3,109
Maine	20
Maryland	3,025
Massachusetts	13
Michigan	21,236
Minnesota	54,015
Mississippi	7,696
Missouri	65,424
Montana	1,813
Nebraska	68,138
Nevada	16
New Jersey	2,366
New Mexico	2,838
New York	6,633
North Carolina	20,853
North Dakota	13,742
Ohio	36,730
Oklahoma	9,668
Oregon	2,308
Pennsylvania	8,162
Rhode Island	1

Footnote at end of table.

Estimated total payment under the feed grain program for 1963 [1]—Continued

[In thousands]

South Carolina	$6,018
South Dakota	15,643
Tennessee	14,925
Texas	64,524
Utah	694
Vermont	49
Virginia	6,298
Washington	2,942
West Virginia	733
Wisconsin	26,016
Wyoming	516
Total	843,842

[1] This includes corn, barley, and grain sorghum.

This is only a part of the cost. In the second place, each year we spend a large and increasing amount of money for storage, interest, and transportation costs for the feed grain program.

In 1961 we spent $463 million.

In 1962 we spent $473 million.

In 1963 we spent $475 million.

I ask unanimous consent that a table showing storage and interest costs of feed grain programs be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Storage and interest costs of feed grain program

[In millions]

Year	Storage and handling	Transportation	Packing and processing	Reseal storage	Imputed interest	Total
1961	$224.8	$52.9	$0.7	$38.1	$147.4	$463.9
1962	213.5	67.3	3.3	59.5	130.1	473.7
1963	184.0	78.2	.8	66.5	145.8	475.3

Source: Department of Agriculture.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If there is added to the amount being spent for payments of $844 million the amount being paid for storage and interest, the cost of the feed grain program is now $1,319 million a year; think of it: $1⅓ billion.

I submit that it does not make any sense to appropriate millions of dollars to build a dam for the purpose of bringing more feed grains into production.

Even if the feed grain were needed, it would be an unjustifiable and uneconomic investment. But when we do not need them, when from an irrigation standpoint the dam has a zero value—in fact, less than zero, because not only can we not use the feed grains, but we would have to spend money to store them—it is particularly nonsensical.

The project will be urged on the ground that it would help the farmers. Not only would it not help farmers generally throughout the country; it would not even help farmers who are supposed to benefit from having their land irrigated.

We should recognize that no group in America has shared less in our prosperity in the past 10 or 15 years than have the farmers. During that period the farmers have increased their efficiency three time as rapidly as have people off the farm. They have done a fine job of increasing productivity and efficiency. In the past 15 years they have doubled their productivity. Today, one farmer does what two farmers did 15 years ago.

The farmers work long hours. According to the Department of Agriculture statistics, farmers in Wisconsin last June worked 11½ hours a day. They work 7 days a week. They work 52 weeks a year. The cows must be milked. The job always must be done.

Furthermore, the farmer makes an investment. He does not merely bring his own efforts, skill, and energy to the job. He brings those, but he also brings a significant amount of his money. The investment has been increasing greatly. The average farmer in Wisconsin must make an investment in his farm of $35,000 or $40,000.

Throughout the United States there is a tremendous investment in farms.

The farmer takes a bigger risk than perhaps any other large group of people in our economy. In spite of that fact, his income is low. It is shamefully low. The income of our farmers is less than half the income of people off the farm. The hourly income is about one-quarter of that of people off the farm.

Why is it low? The farmer's income is low because of overproduction; because we cannot solve the problem of tailoring farm production to demand; because we find ourselves in a position where the efficiency and the productivity of the farmer is so great that he is drowning under his productivity. The more he produces, either the greater the drain on the taxpayers or the lower his income, or both.

The crux of the farmer's difficulty, the heart of the difficulty, is that there is too much production of farm products. That is why our farm program is designed to take land out of production, to discourage farmers from producing so much. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars for this purpose. Now we turn around with the other hand, in another bill, the public works bill, and appropriate millions of dollars to bring more land into production to produce the very crops that we are spending so much to take out of production.

It is not as if the situation were going to be better in a few years. The fact is that the situation will become worse in coming years.

We can expect over the next few years to have literally millions of additional acres going back into production as the soil bank contracts expire.

The fact is that in 1963, before this year is through, there will be some 6,800,000 additional acres in production. That means they will be in production or the taxpayer will have to dig into his pocket to pay the farmer to keep that land out of production.

In 1964, the additional acreage will be 3,400,000.

In 1965 it will be 577,323.

In 1966 it will be 2,271,644.

In 1967 it will be 1,691,506.

In 1968 it will be 6,120,064.

In 1969 it will be 3,570,020.

And so on ad infinitum.

I ask unanimous consent that a chart showing estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE C.—*1956-61 conservation reserve program—Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States* [1]

State	Acres to be released as of Dec. 31										Total acres in reserve	Total number of contracts
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970		
Northeast area	91,491	49,882	421,945	244,795	4,405	18,500	31,431	236,067	223,942	27,274	1,349,732	27,917
Connecticut	118	36	2,522	717	92	17	108	498	451	3	4,562	190
Delaware	502	122	8,418	2,887	91	336	231	5,149	521		18,257	279
Maine	12,817	9,355	15,141	15,943	198	3,113	9,075	23,868	21,427	10,416	121,353	2,632
Maryland	8,846	3,490	39,669	13,013	266	1,140	1,498	10,207	4,853		82,982	1,467
Massachusetts	111	38	1,081	361	38	31	53	376	588	40	2,717	109
New Hampshire	67	63	1,469	400		147	312	4,390	4,330	314	11,492	437
New Jersey	2,962	1,727	25,130	14,066	33	341	91	1,991	1,913		48,254	1,061
New York	36,009	21,160	127,155	76,760	1,260	7,384	10,417	96,738	107,656	11,938	496,477	9,472
Pennsylvania	20,097	11,009	138,407	82,858	677	2,385	3,656	47,632	53,609	323	360,653	7,163
Rhode Island	19		10	25				8			62	4
Vermont	87	121	3,651	2,789	198	663	1,920	11,651	7,107	4,214	32,401	987
Virginia	8,422	1,806	38,831	22,891	1,187	2,811	1,933	21,671	13,650		113,202	2,355
West Virginia	1,434	955	20,461	12,085	365	132	2,137	11,888	7,837	26	57,320	1,761

Footnote at end of table.

TABLE C.—*1956–61 conservation reserve program—Estimated reserve acres for which contracts expire each year, by States* [1]—Continued

State	Acres to be released as of Dec. 31										Total acres in reserve	Total number of contracts
	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970		
Southeast area	150,653	114,081	734,749	412,730	6,699	298,727	537,763	1,155,973	780,126	18,976	4,210,477	70,745
Alabama	12,060	5,515	64,141	33,959	387	29,624	50,206	122,783	88,210	----------	406,885	8,279
Arkansas	33,806	28,042	171,382	76,519	1,302	12,070	39,304	150,452	76,806	----------	589,683	9,289
Florida	8,703	3,470	10,772	15,985	253	50,409	28,241	58,418	40,821	----------	226,072	2,162
Georgia	23,211	16,852	83,374	60,652	1,375	109,401	223,926	315,665	220,721	301	1,055,478	14,730
Louisiana	4,707	2,822	46,506	22,092	318	13,875	41,757	59,703	25,509	----------	217,289	3,275
Mississippi	30,488	26,396	108,577	26,659	1,056	17,568	21,184	61,376	24,706	1,528	319,538	5,652
North Carolina	5,488	4,931	61,481	53,362	273	20,453	24,001	67,478	29,804	----------	267,271	7,728
South Carolina	12,676	6,004	46,360	48,383	445	32,123	87,080	196,450	187,581	17,147	634,249	11,754
Tennessee	19,514	20,049	142,156	75,119	1,290	13,204	22,064	123,648	76,968	----------	494,012	7,876
Midwest area	296,132	139,365	2,079,972	1,027,477	11,660	49,628	33,862	678,863	402,519	2,909	4,722,387	70,035
Illinois	13,017	4,414	270,298	85,750	546	2,454	986	43,890	11,896	412	433,663	6,048
Indiana	22,831	6,065	257,796	118,357	1,859	1,458	723	53,186	24,607	69	486,951	7,800
Iowa	60,508	18,669	352,304	159,598	2,275	1,607	1,244	34,263	16,765	158	647,391	7,541
Kentucky	13,901	7,212	164,837	66,532	1,071	1,858	3,196	95,862	31,445	----------	385,914	5,467
Michigan	52,948	23,358	254,267	150,722	1,864	17,249	10,067	93,141	96,613	392	700,621	11,444
Missouri	50,766	50,552	265,884	150,577	1,987	6,703	6,167	209,207	83,043	276	825,162	10,882
Ohio	26,051	9,003	237,407	137,567	905	1,568	1,012	48,190	47,793	107	509,603	8,690
Wisconsin	56,110	20,092	277,179	158,374	1,153	16,731	10,467	101,124	90,357	1,495	733,082	12,163
Northwest area	774,404	521,399	2,144,852	1,184,354	37,182	554,122	409,886	1,955,700	1,289,441	9,571	8,880,911	59,067
Idaho	20,004	8,545	85,696	46,633	1,848	8,844	2,343	78,614	34,862	----------	280,789	1,502
Minnesota	225,629	199,603	506,303	153,502	10,727	231,892	174,140	285,848	93,935	9,509	1,891,088	19,972
Montana	31,496	16,342	140,702	59,405	2,734	17,144	16,958	221,076	122,650	46	628,553	2,031
Nebraska	59,614	25,864	323,621	130,566	2,307	13,559	10,919	221,955	84,692	----------	873,097	7,359
North Dakota	204,060	138,980	495,601	398,803	8,407	200,843	137,886	557,151	558,020	----------	2,699,751	12,280
Oregon	24,457	14,253	75,804	33,015	1,314	11,749	8,427	37,933	23,021	16	229,989	2,229
South Dakota	182,319	95,485	380,893	315,365	5,646	61,239	43,600	417,962	317,286	----------	1,819,795	10,964
Washington	11,019	18,822	106,270	44,500	4,199	3,168	14,082	91,629	40,081	----------	333,770	2,181
Wyoming	15,806	3,505	29,962	9,165	----------	5,684	1,531	43,532	14,894	----------	124,079	549
Southwest area	1,191,937	489,006	1,433,613	551,771	517,377	1,350,667	678,564	2,093,461	873,992	----------	9,180,388	73,241
Arizona	4,846	476	400	----------	----------	1,552	385	----------	----------	----------	7,659	65
California	19,749	9,814	84,529	36,134	2,927	2,552	3,103	30,680	11,336	----------	200,824	1,071
Colorado	104,019	43,979	123,634	26,643	3,192	192,088	95,025	587,812	111,554	----------	1,287,946	4,733
Kansas	80,665	86,954	301,484	102,539	12,990	93,776	113,139	397,763	257,912	----------	1,447,222	12,624
Nevada	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------
New Mexico	88,425	15,355	13,657	568	250,642	310,756	111,819	72,092	415	----------	863,729	3,496
Oklahoma	167,519	104,159	296,861	141,207	6,166	153,375	98,242	308,558	213,048	----------	1,489,135	16,841
Texas	706,668	220,615	571,826	232,023	240,531	549,013	242,689	628,916	255,594	----------	3,647,869	33,431
Utah	20,046	7,654	41,228	12,657	929	47,555	14,162	67,640	24,133	----------	236,004	980
United States	2,504,617	1,313,733	6,815,131	3,421,127	577,323	2,271,644	1,691,506	6,120,064	3,570,020	58,730	28,343,895	301,005

[1] Report from Data Processing Center of contracts on record as of Dec. 1, 1961. ASCS, Soil Bank Division, Dec. 29, 1961.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Some people argue that by the time the dam is built and more land is brought into production we shall need it.

The fact is that we shall need not more, but less land for production in future years. This assertion takes into account the prospect that there will be a larger population, and that people will eat more. Even if more agricultural products are exported, we shall need less land than we now need.

The reason is obvious to anyone who has studied land chemistry, irrigation, insecticides, and who recognizes the marvels of modern American agriculture. There are many ways in which farmers, by the use of irrigation and fertilizer, can greatly increase productivity.

We shall not need more productive land in the foreseeable future, or during the life of this dam. We shall need less land.

Most Senators have perhaps seen a motion picture, "Bridge on the River Kwai," or, if they have not, perhaps they have read the book. It is one of the most dramatic and beautiful demonstrations of the utter, sheer irony and waste of war that I have ever seen. It was a dramatization of a British regiment which had fallen into the hands of the Japanese soldiers in the southwest Pacific in World War II. The British had superb morale and a leader with great courage and fine leadership qualities. The colonel was disturbed about the possibility that this wonderful regiment, with their fine courage and spirit, might lose their morale. He himself stood up to the toughest kind of torture inflicted by the Japanese. They placed him in circumstances that were cruel and difficult for him, but he was able to stand up to that torture.

The Japanese proposed that, in order to keep the regiment occupied and keep their morale up, they build an extraordinarily complicated and difficult bridge for the Japanese which the Japanese had failed repeatedly to build. The captured British regiment under the colonel's inspired leadership built a magnificent bridge, one that the commanding officer said would last for 600 years. Of course, the irony was that the bridge frustrated the very purpose for which those brave British soldiers had fought and sacrificed and risked their lives to hold back the Japanese military effort, to frustrate and defeat it, not help it. The commanding officer became swept up in the building of that bridge, and had his men working hard and using their genius and effort endlessly day after day in building the bridge. But after the bridge was finished, the Allied forces sent saboteurs to blow up the bridge.

The saboteurs, after terrific trials and tribulations, came to the bridge and ingeniously contrived to blow it up. As they were about to do so, the British colonel, who had devoted so much of his genius and leadership and the efforts of his men to building the bridge suddenly saw them. He saw that they were about to blow up his pride and joy, his magnificent 600-year bridge. He was out of his head with fury. In an instinctive betrayal of his country he called attention of the Japanese to the saboteurs and tried to cut the wires, to keep the bridge from being blown up. The patriots, heroic saboteurs who had come there at great risk on this dangerous mission in behalf of the allied cause, were shot down and killed.

"Bridge on the River Kwai," was a dramatic illustration of what happens when ends are forgotten and how apparently honorable means can violate the ends they only exist to serve. The reason why I give this example is that I believe we have lost sight of the end, the objective of our reclamation program by going into this idiotic and obsolete notion of bringing more land into production.

At the time the project was authorized, back in 1944, we needed more land. We had a shortage of food in the free world, and we were supplying the free world with food for war purposes.

At that time it made some sense. However, today, the last thing on earth we need is more land in production. However, that is what we are doing. This food, when it is produced, will have to go into surplus. We do not need it. Nevertheless, it will be produced, and then put it in storage.

What really puts the icing on the cake is the fact that the farmers whose land is to be irrigated do not want the project.

I appeared before the Appropriations Committee in 1962, and again this year against the project. After I appeared in 1962 I expected that the people from Kansas would not be happy about my appearance against the project, and that I would receive some letters protesting my butting my nose into their business. Not so. I received many letters in support of my position. I received sworn affidavits from farmers.

I received affidavits from 90 percent of the farmers in the area who own 85 percent of the land, in opposition to the project. They said they were against it. I have a list of the farmers who are involved. I have their names and addresses. They are the farmers who own the land in this area. In order that there may be no mistake about the fact that the farmers involved do not want the project and are against it, I ask unanimous consent that every name and every address on the list I have here be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Landowners within the proposed Glen Elder Irrigation District who have registered their objections by petitions to the formation of said irrigation project

Name	Address	Acreage
Floyd Rominger and Thelma Rominger	Glen Elder, Kans.	80
W. L. Fuller and Etta Fuller	do	160
Elwood Harrison and Mary Harrison	do	160
Quentin Kelley and Pauline Kelley	Beloit, Kans.	160
John Bunger, guardian of William and Frederick Bunger, minors.	do	146
William Thiessen and Emma J. Thiessen	do	427
		186¾
Stewart Barker and Louise L. Barker	do	160
Charloy V. Vetter and Charlotte Vetter	do	318
Anna J. Olson	Denver, Colo.	151
W. D. Thiessen and Oliveno Thiessen	Beloit, Kans.	154
A. C. Remus and Irena Remus	do	560
Effa May Metcalf	do	126
Paul James	do	221
Gerald Smith and Aileen Smith	do	241
W. Earl Porter and Thelma Porter	do	466.8
Elmer Golladay and Sarah Golladay	Glen Elder, Kans.	80
Lena James and M. R. James	Beloit, Kans.	160
Maggie McClintock	do	306
Minnie Thiessen	do	160
Lena James and M. R. James	do	110
Louise Thiessen	do	384½
Ellen Davis	Salina, Kans.	160
Florence L. McKechnie	Glen Elder, Kans.	160
Hamer Williams and Emma C. Williams	Beloit, Kans.	480
Millie Clover	Glen Elder, Kans.	320
Winifred Johnson	Beloit, Kans.	435
Elmer Porter and Christine Porter	do	200
Jay F. Johnson	do	110
Doyle L. Remus and Mrs. Shirley Remus	Glen Elder, Kans.	283
Maxine Reinhardt, R. A. Reinhardt, Elizabeth Dean, and Keith Dean.	do	150
Mrs. Carl A. Porter	Beloit, Kans.	160
Anna R. Thiessen, Carol Thiessen, Marjorie Thiessen Havel, Kenneth D. Havel, Vernon Thiessen, and Anna L. Thiessen.	do	105
William J. Remus and Orpha A. Remus	Glen Elder, Kans.	160
Emma Lund and Frank J. Lund	do	280
Leo H. Eberle	do	10
Mrs. Sylvia E. Vetter and John C. Vetter	Beloit, Kans.	383
Guy Noller	Glen Elder, Kans.	196
Lula Rawlins	Beloit, Kans.	398½
Mrs. Ruth Kirgis and George Kirgis	do	160
Roy A. Fobes and Trella Fobes	do	360
J. A. Muck and May E. Muck	Glen Elder, Kans.	23
Vincent Engelbert and Elizabeth Engelbert	Beloit, Kans.	160
E. D. Metcalf and Mrs. E. D. Metcalf	do	160
Albert McDysan	do	20
Darroll L. Fobes	do	80
Robert Metcalf and Elizabeth Metcalf	do	160
Doyle V. Neifert and Esther G. Neifert	Glen Elder, Kans.	80
Eldon McCune and Chloe McCune	do	112
Dean Miller	do	5
Fred Boehner, Laura Boehner, Earl Boehner, and Doris Boehner.	do	160
Davida Simpson and Elmer E. Simpson	do	40
L. L. Humes and Bessie Humes	do	80
George Megli and Bernice Megil	do	240
Sadie M. Gansel and Helene Gansel Wood	Beloit	23
Ferd R. Gansel	Hill City	
Martha P. Morton	Concordia	
Joe D. Gansel	Beloit	
Joe Hicks, William Hicks, and Virginia Bunger	do	256
H. E. Marquis	Glen Elder	120
Carl Thiessen and William Thiessen	Beloit	150
Eva Irean Grigsby and James W. Grigsby	Jacksonville, Oreg.	160
Verna D. Rawlings and E. B. Rawlings	Santa Clara, Calif.	
W. Earl Porter and Fronia Porter Harned	Beloit	109
Carl Thiessen	do	100
Arnold C. File and Dee Ann File	do	160
A. Graff by Paul T. Graff, agent	do	140
Amos Chapman and Alma Chapman	do	145½
Arnold C. File and Dee Ann File	do	200
Ralph Nicholson and Meredith Nicholson	Glen Elder	80
John Porter	do	80
G. H. Gish and Lacy Gish	do	9
Ralph Nichloson and Meredith Nicholson	do	220
M. E. Gentleman and Ava B. Gentleman	do	262
Gerald Farr	Beloit	160
Ora Porter	do	160
Frank T. Nash and Marcy T. Nash	Glen Elder	425
Nash estate by Frank T. Nash, administrator	do	300
Mrs. Clara Rominger	do	160
Merle L. Campbell	Topeka	37
Seth F. Wilson	Asherville	199
Alfred Emmot and Carrie Emmot	Beloit	80
Duane K. Stilley	Seabrook, Tex.	600
Vera M. Cruse and Floid E. Cruse	Farragut, Iowa	
Louis E. Stilley	Fort Worth, Tex.	
T. Boyd Hull	Beloit	389
Mrs. Ross Strawn	do	178
Nick A. Ernzen	do	254
Lola Remus, Mary Virginia Remus, Kim Remus, Twila V. Remus, and John B. Kruse.	do	160
Kenneth Wendell and Lucile K. Wendell	do	47
John H. Matheis	do	345½
Charlotte File	do	80
Mrs. Anna Jones	Wichita, Kans.	160
Susan File	Beloit	235
Donald Dooley	do	160
John C. Vonderheide, Rose Vonderheide, Katherine Vonderheide, and William Vonderheide.	do	280
Luep A. Brackett	do	95
Mary E. Stover, agent	do	160
Seth F. Wilson and Theron Wilson	Asherville	135
Lawrence Briney	Beloit	20
Wilbus W. Kent	do	137
Harry R. James and Margaret M. James	do	160
Robert Vernon, Betty Jean Vernon, and Mrs. Effie J. Vernon.	Simpson	280
Bon Duff	Beloit	160
Joe McClure	Simpson	160
Mrs. May Vernon	do	160
Thomas L. Carlin	Beloit	120
Joe Krone	do	42
Edgar T. Pierce and Hazel Pierce	do	79
Mrs. Ella C. Wagner	do	153
Irma Schellinger	do	88½
Daisy E. Guard	do	122
Everett M. Burkhead, Ethel Wolverton, and Doris Lieurance.	do	109
Gertrude E. Burnette and William Burnette	Asherville	152
Chas File	Beloit	359
Otto E. Lange and Mary L, Lange	Asherville	226
Marietta Stilley	Beloit	80
Viola E. Pearce	do	126
Frances Heinen	do	302
R. J. Fittell and Cora B. Fittell	do	148½
Lola Remus	do	388
Mrs. Ethel Burnette	do	160
Jess Dameron	do	67
Regina M. Hodler	do	215
John A. Heller and Rose D. Heller	do	146
Leonard J. Heller	do	69½
William T. Heller	do	80
Robert N. Sherrard	do	178
Duane E. File	do	160
Susagnes Heller Schwerman	do	79
Irene Hyde Miller	do	120
Louise Hyde Dooley	do	420
Elizabeth Myers	do	80
Vernon Thiessen and Anna L. Thiessen	do	200
Wilfred J. Wendell	do	187
Thomas S. Hyde	do	240
Elizabeth Schwerman	do	241
Miles E. File	do	480
Melvin C. File and Mrs. Melvin C. File	do	120
Earl File and Telva File	do	583
Mrs. Lena M. Roberts	do	307
V. R. Schmidt and Katherine M. Schmidt	do	160
Dan G. Wood and Helene K. Wood	do	200
Robert Wagner and Margaret Wagner	do	80
Do	do	106
C. E. Plymire, by Lois Plymire Pruitt, guardian	do	120
Margaret Anderson and Edwin Davis	Glen Elder	10
Mrs. N. L. Davis	do	120
Albert L. Davis	do	40
Rex Borgen	Asherville	160
Mrs. Melva McClintock	do	240
Frank O. Pearson	Simpson	123
C. A. Robertson and Mrs. C. A. Robertson	do	240
Mrs. Thelma Spicher	do	320
James Robertson	do	239
Marie Niehaus	Beloit	81
Eugene File	do	94
Charles Pearson	Simpson	208½
Harrell Guard, Sr.	Asherville	160
Beatrice Childs	Simpson	425
Total		28,603½

Cloud County landowners registering objection by petitions to formation of Glen Elder irrigation project

Name	Address	Acreage
W. A. Adams	Glasco, Kans	240
Mabel A. Childs and C. R. Childs	Delphos, Kans	80
Do	do	195
T. M. Butler	Glasco, Kans	340
Walter Sheets and May Sheets	do	200
Florence Gray Bundy	do	40
Mrs. Howard Courtney and H. L. Courtney	do	170
Wesley Fuller	do	160
Emery Yennl and Maxine Yenni	do	640
Lawrence Sheets and Eva Sheets	do	697
Joe Sheets	Concordia, Kans	304
Peter H. Beek and Maude C. Beek	Glasco, Kans	160
Willis Beek	do	204
Leona Smith (Cyrler) McKemey	Jamestown, Kans	74
John V. Downey	Glasco, Kans	160
Joe Downey	do	320
Ada J. Orebaugh	do	551
Leslie O. Wealand and Elsie L. Wealand	do	80
William K. Dopp	do	100
Sarah E. Dopp	do	11
Hattie M. Nowels	do	153
Arden E. Halderson and Orville Halderson	do	160
Boyd Chapman and Mrs. Boyd Chapman	do	9
Blanche Teasley and Dale Teasley	do	4.49
Claude Orebaugh	do	10
Max D. Martin and Lorene Brown Martin	do	345
Mrs. Mary Ellen Lott	do	80
Jess M. Dalrymple and Evelyn H. Dalrymple	do	150
J. M. Davidson	do	900
Mrs. Clara Pinkall	do	160
Earl E. Keller	Clyde, Kans	360
Mrs. R. L. Broek and John R. Broek	Glasco, Kans	396.05
Walter Butler and Bertha Butler	do	448
John R. Broek	do	454.07
Martin E. Butler	do	320
Virginia L. Steinbroek	do	220
Ray H. Fetters	Manhattan, Kans	
Celestine Louthan and Robert Louthan	Simpson, Kans	320
Robert Louthan, Celestine Louthan, Frank Louthan, Mrs. Frank Louthan, James R. Louthan, John E. Evert, Mrs. Etta Evert; Herman Evert, and Mrs. Emeline Evert.	do	400
Clint Evert	do	12
Jean M. Noel, Elizabeth L. Chestnut and Robert Chestnut.	Glasco, Kans	267
Chas. Gehrke, Ida Gehrke, Duane Gehrke, and Carol Gehrke.	do	480
George E. Bond, Mrs. George E. Bond, and Cathcrine Bond.	do	1
Sophia C. Horn, Marlo G. Horn, Eleanor H. Thompson, and Letha J. Horn, by Sophia C. Horn, attorney in fact.	do	160
Homer Hoffman and Elizabeth Hoffman	Simpson, Kans	80
Margaret C. Gruenthal	Glasco, Kans	106
Elmer Halderson	do	480
Henry Prochaska and Mrs. Henry Prochaska	do	160
Emma E. Chapman	do	413
George M. Chapman	Beloit, Kans	
Total		11,810.61

Ottawa County landowners registering objection by petitions to formation of Glen Elder irrigation project

Name	Address	Acreage
Mrs. Caroline Atwell McKain	Manhattan, Kans	160
Alva F. Adams	Delphos, Kans	70
Christina Hurtig	do	160
John Nelson, Sr	do	1,341
Harold C. Hollis	do	160
Avis Taylor and Earl G. Taylor	do	308
Avis Taylor and Ellis Paramore	do	320
J. M. Hart	do	20
Allen L. Atwell	do	204
B. M. Halderson	do	439
Fred L. Jilka	do	160
Lawrence J. Hart and Mary A. Hart	do	357
Leo Allison	do	160
Charles E. Parks	do	250
Mrs. Neva Wilkins	do	161
John R. Nelson	Delphos, Kans	160
Minnie G. Wealand	Glasco, Kans	80
Clara Latham	Delphos, Kans	79
Alma Atwell and Guy Sumerll	do	202.5
Grace M. Narns and Nellie C. Burger	Kansas City, Mo	
Theodore Paramore, Corliss Paramore, and Ellis Paramore.	Delphos, Kans	868
Larry C. Atwell	Tucson, Ariz	160
Clyde Smith	Ottawa, Kans	374
Burton Smith	Delphos, Kans	323
Robert Mortimer	do	372.5
Laura Olson, Anna Olson, and Mary Olson	Glasco, Kans	100
W. A. Adams	do	160
Total		7,149

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, these farmers are opposed to the project. They were not satisfied or won over last year when the Senate appropriated planning money, even though it was a relatively small amount—about a million dollars or so; they are still fighting it. These farmers do not want the project. They are still against it. They are spending their hard-earned money to send spokesmen to Washington to oppose the project. They have appeared before the Appropriations Committee. They are incensed about it. They are good, patriotic citizens, who are looking at the project from their own standpoint. They say this project is bad for them. They say it will not work. They say they will not use the irrigation that is to be provided. They are opposed to it for many reasons. They do not want it.

It seems to me that when the Senate is considering a bill in connection with which the only beneficiaries of the bill are against it, we should pay some attention to that opposition. After all, who else could benefit from the irrigation aspect of this program but the farmers who own the land? The farmers have said they do not want the project. They have petitioned this Senator and have told him that they do not want it. They have signed affidavits to that effect.

Under the circumstances, the Senate should not appropriate the money for that purpose.

Mr. President, the entire irrigation justification of the project is based on the value of additional farm crops. If the farm crops are valued at zero, the irrigational investment brings a zero return. As I tried to emphasize, the value is less than zero so far as the taxpayers are concerned, because all of the additional production of feed grain can go nowhere else but into storage. When it goes into storage there will be the additional cost of the storage on the taxpayer; also the interest and the cost of transportation on the taxpayer. We shall have to pay that additional cost. Can anyone honestly appraise additional feed grains as worth anything to our economy? The original estimate of $17 million for the costs of the irrigation aspect of the project would not only yield no return, but would add a multimillion dollar additional dollar burden.

What is it costing to bring these worse than worthless acres into production per acre?

We have made some calculations. It is not easy to make such calculations, because they involve complex discount factors, as well as other factors. One must use very careful arithmetic to make accurate calculations.

The total construction cost is estimated at $17 million. That represents a cost of $810 an acre.

The amount repaid by irrigators is $4 million. That is without interest. That represents a cost of $191 per acre. That is over a 50-year period. We can calculate the interest by determining the average balance, which would be $2 million, and then applying the interest rate factor to it.

In addition, $13 million would be repaid by power users after 100 years are up.

This is about as fantastic a conception as anyone can imagine.

It is wholly unjust, because not 1 kilowatt of energy will be used. We are assuming that the power users will repay it. Under the law they will be required to repay it after a hundred years. They will have to repay this amount in higher rates.

The chances are that the overwhelming majority will not realize that they are paying it, but they will have to repay it. However, they will not receive any benefits. The difficulty is that the interest factor is not considered, and that the Federal Government does not get money for nothing. It must pay interest on the money. The Federal Government must pay for the money. It must borrow the money and pay interest on it. That means that if we multiply 50 years by $80,000, which is the average annual interest at 4 percent—and that is what the Federal Government will have to pay, on the average—the interest amounts to $4 million.

Then, 100 years times $520,000—that is 4 percent on $13 million—is $52 million, or a total of $56 million with a per acre cost of $2,700.

That much money, 100 years from now, or even 50 years from now, is involved, but that will not be worth as much as it is today. We must use the present value, and that figure must be discounted. If we provide a 2.5-percent discount factor, which is the factor that is used by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers—and apply it to $80,000 for 50 years, the amount is $2,269,000. $520,000 for 100 years, applying the same discount factor, amounts to $12,742,000.

The present discounted value total is $15,011,000, not $56 million.

The acreage cost is not $2,700, but much less. If we apply the 4-percent discount factor, it is $20,619,000, instead of $15,011,000. The per acre cost is $982.

I shall not detain the Senate further. I ask unanimous consent to put a table showing these costs per acre in the RECORD, because I believe anyone who is interested in determining whether my calculations are accurate should have an opportunity to do so.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Aggregate and per acre costs of the Glen Elder irrigation project with and without imputed interest

	Aggregate	Per acre
Cost without interest:		
Total construction cost	$17,000,000	$810
Amount repaid by irrigators	4,000,000	191
Amount repaid by power users	13,000,000	619
Different estimates of rolated interest cost (4 percent interest rate in all cases):		
Total over the years:		
50 years × $80,000 (average)	4,000,000	------
100 years × $520,000	52,000,000	------
	56,000,000	2,700
Present discounted value of interest:		
2.5 percent discount factor:		
$80,000 for 50 years	2,269,000	------
$520,000 for 100 years	12,742,000	------
	15,011,000	738
4 percent discount factor:		
$80,000 for 50 years	1,580,000	------
$520,000 for 100 years	19,039,000	------
	20,619,000	982
Total cost: Present construction cost plus present discounted value of imputed interest:		
2.5 percent discount factor	----------	1,548
4 percent discount factor	----------	1,792

Mr. PROXMIRE. On this basis, I think it is completely fair—and this was checked carefully with mathematicians and experts of the Bureau of Reclamation—to say that the cost per acre would be between $1,500 and $1,792. That is the cost per acre for worthless land. This land is worth nothing. It is acreage producing feed grain; and feed grain has no value; it is surplus.

Think of it: $1,500 to $1,800 per acre. The best farmland in Wisconsin is worth $800 or less. . Yet unless my amendment passes we spend $1,500 to $1,800 per acre.

Last year in my speech in the Senate, I described the way in which the total irrigation cost of $17 million was divided among irrigators, power users in the Missouri River Valley, and general taxpayers. This table, entitled "Calculation of the Subsidy From the Public to the Irrigating Farmers on the Glen Elder Unit," shows how the total cost is allocated. Two and one-half percent and 4 percent discount factors are applied to the total estimate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Calculation of the subsidy from the public to the irrigating farmers on the Glen Elder unit

[In millions]

	Total payment, ignoring interest	Present discounted value at following discount factors	
		2.5 percent	4 percent
Payment by irrigators [1]	$4.000	$2.269	$1.581
Payment by power users in the Missouri River Basin [2]	13.000	1.100	.260
Payment by the general taxpayer	----------	13.630	15.162
Total repayment of the reimbursable costs of the irrigation project	17.000	17.000	17.000

[1] Payment by the irrigators is on the basis of $80,000 annual payments for a 50-year repayment period.

[2] The payment by the power users is assumed to be made in the year 2060 when the power features of the Missouri River project will be repaid, along with the other existing irrigation projects, which will then permit the annual net income of the power features of the Missouri River Basin project to be used for the Glen Elder project. Lump-sum payment is assumed, since the annual net income from the power features will be large enough for this once it becomes available.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The table shows that over the years the burden on the general taxpayer—not the irrigator whose farm is proposed to be irrigated and who would get some benefit from it; not the power user, on whom is imposed a burden, although he gets no benefit—but the general taxpayer in Hawaii, Wisconsin, Texas, and throughout the Nation, will be between $13.6 million and $15 million for a $17 million project. In other words, the general taxpayer would be paying most of the cost of the project.

We hear, over and over again, when we dispute reclamation projects, that they are fully repayable; that the taxpayers do not have to worry about them, because the irrigators will pay the money back, or the power users will pay it back.

If we recognize what interest rates are today, if we recognize the way in which the payments will be made, the real burden is in fact on the general taxpayer. The general taxpayer will bear about 75 to 90 percent of the burden. It cannot be argued that this money will be paid back; it will not be paid back.

One of the primary benefits to which the proponents of the project point is supposed to be the irrigation storage return. Of the annual benefits of slightly more than $3 million anticipated from this project, $564,700 annually is anticipated as a result of irrigation. However, more than 80 percent of the landowners living below Glen Elder in the area that logically would be in the irrigation district have signed notarized petitions that they do not wish to join an irrigation district. I do not want this statement to be confused with the fact that 90 percent of the landowners have signed affidavits that they sent to me, indicating that they are opposed to the project. In addition, 80 percent of the landowners have said that they will not join any irrigation districts; they will not permit their land to be irrigated; they will not have anything to do with the project. These 383 landowners control 49,795 acres in the valley just below the proposed irrigation dam. In view of this, water storage for irrigation would be completely useless. The expense of acquiring additional land for this storage would be wasteful.

This is another reason why my amendment, which the Parliamentarian has indicated will be in order, makes sense. The money should not be spent for irrigation, not only because of the argument I have made that additional feed grains are not needed, but also because the landowners have indicated that they will not join any irrigation district and will not permit their land to be irrigated.

The proposed dam would cover Waconda Springs, a mineral water spring. Thus the water in the lake would be of questionable value either for irrigation or for a multiple water supply. Moreover, the land below the proposed dam is not suitable for irrigation. It develops into a tight so-called gumbo soil that is not conducive to immediate water absorption.

One of the astonishing things about this $76 million project is the mystery surrounding its authorization. The project now is to cost $76,131,000. We shall be asked to appropriate, in the bill which will come up on Monday, $5 million to begin construction. Of course, after that it will be undoubtedly too late to do anything about this scandalous waste. A year ago, the total cost was estimated at $60 million, when I first spoke on the subject. The amount has increased by $16 million in the past year.

Yet the sole congressional authorization for this project is one line in a 1944 act—an act 19 years old—which contained more than 300 projects. This project appeared in the so-called Pick-Sloan Authorization Act of 1944. Moreover, as listed in that wartime omnibus act, the project differed almost completely from the current proposal. The only carryover is the name and apparently the authorization.

One of the great problems that confronts President Johnson in keeping the budget down is the number of built-in increases in the budget. That is always a terrible problem for the President and Congress when they want to economize. How can they economize when Congress, by law, has built in provisions for money that must be spent in the future?

That is what is occurring in connection with this project. We shall be spending $5 million now, but guaran-

teeing that if President Johnson or some other President in the future wants to cut spending, he will not be in a position to do so, because Congress is forcing spending on the President.

I have tried to indicate that the Glen Elder project is as worthless and unjustified as can be conceived. Furthermore, to show the difference in the project, in 1944, when it was authorized—and that was the only time it was authorized—Glen Elder Dam was to have cost $17 million and would have provided 300,000 acre-feet of storage capacity. Today the same project is to cost $76 million and is estimated to provide probably more than 1 million acre-feet of storage capacity.

The Pick-Sloan authorization was open ended; that is, the projects could be initiated at any time. The $17 million listed for Glen Elder was merely an estimate in the committee report and was not included in the bill. That kind of authorization contains great dangers and very little protection for the taxpayer. Once a small amount has been authorized, it can be expended in any way desired and the amount can go as high as is desired; the sky is the limit.

Some 300 projects were originally described in the 1944 legislation. Only about 40 have been initiated to date.

The original authorization permitted appropriations of about $200 million; but based on the original estimate, the cost of all projects was to have been about $1 billion. The authorized appropriations have been gradually increased from time to time. For example, the last increase, of roughly $100 million for fiscal years 1964 and 1965, was in the Public Works authorization bill just passed, H.R. 8667. The total estimated cost of all the original projects in the 1944 legislation is now about $3 billion. In other words, the amount has expanded threefold.

As Senators know, the Senate approves projects, by and large, on the benefit-cost principle. That is, if the benefits exceed the cost, the Senate is likely to go ahead with the project. If the benefits are less than the cost, I do not know of any project that has been passed. There may have been one or two in the past. Theoretically, such a project could be passed. But under such circumstances, Senators usually say that such a project is not worth the money; that arithmetic proves the project is not worth the cost, so the Senate does not proceed with it.

In the case of Glen Elder, the benefit-cost ratio is currently 1.34 to 1. This is a quite feeble benefit-cost ratio.

Admittedly, some are less, but this is low. A ratio of 1.34 to 1 would suggest that the benefits, as computed by the Bureau of Reclamation, are slightly in excess of the costs of the project. However, the assumptions used in computing the benefits are extremely artificial.

The discount rate which has been applied to obtain a ratio of 1.34 to 1 is 2½ percent. This is about as artificially unrealistic an assumption as one could make.

The interest rate now being used for benefit-cost ratios has been increased in recent months. It is currently 2⅞ percent for new projects and, I understand, will shortly be raised to 3 percent. However, no attempt has been made to revise the benefit-cost ratio for existing projects such as Glen Elder.

A low interest rate is absolutely crucial, to justify this project. The more the money costs, the more one has to pay to borrow, and the more benefits one expects to receive. Therefore, the lower the discount or interest rate, the less one can assume he has to pay for the money, the easier it is to justify the project, because the less the benefits have to be.

The interest discount rate in this case should be, at a minimum, 4 percent, because the Federal Government borrows money at 4 percent. The lowest prime commercial rate today is about 4 percent. On this basis, the benefit-cost ratio from this factor alone would fall to 0.9 to 1.

In other words, if we assume a 4 percent interest rate, the benefits would be exceeded by the cost, so the project would be unprofitable to the Government, and would be ridiculous to undertake. In fact, on any basis, even if we give the benefit of the doubt to the alleged irrigation benefits and if we assume that the feed grains thus brought into production would be worth the alleged price—although we know they would be worth nothing—it is clear that this project is unjustified. It is apparent that the ridiculous, inaccurate, and dishonest—and I use carefully and accurately the word "dishonest"—2½-percent rate must be used if the project is to be justified. But, Mr. President, even that is not enough; even then, it is necessary to assume that the proposed project would have a life, not of 25 or 35 years, but of 100 years—a most unrealistic assumption. A projected life of 25 or 35 years might seem fairly reasonable and logical in view of changing technological methods and changing farming and irrigation projects and the possibility of making breakthroughs with flood control and the use of water and in supplying the need for water, and in view of the fact that certain water studies are now being undertaken for the first time. Therefore, one might believe that a projected life of 25 or 35 years would be fairly realistic. However, the life of the project which has been assumed in this case is the fantastic one of 100 years, which is entirely unreasonable.

Furthermore, if we assume a 4-percent interest rate and a 50-year life, which still would be extremely favorable in the case of Glen Elder, the benefit-cost ratio would be only 0.8 to 1. In other words, on the basis of this more reasonable assumption, we would be getting 80 cents worth of service for every dollar spent on the project; but that is in direct and arithmetically provable contrast to the very welcome assurance given by President Johnson that he expects a dollar's worth of services to be provided for each dollar of taxes spent.

But in this case, only 80 cents worth of services would be obtained for each dollar of taxes spent on the project—and then only on the basis that the feed grains thus brought into production would be worth something, whereas, as I have already stated, they would be worth less than nothing at all.

Furthermore, Mr. President, this project, if actually constructed, would essentially—essentially, not eventually—destroy the city of Downs, Kans. The people of that city would have to abandon their homes, shops, and stores, because the reservoir which would be created by the project would inundate the city, unless a very substantial dike or wall were built virtually completely around the entire community; and even if that were to be done, who would wish to live behind such a wall?

Furthermore, Mr. President, the costs of the project, now estimated at more than $76 million, do not take into account the probable cost of condemning the city of Downs, which would be at least $2 million more than is now contemplated.

It is said that the people of Downs are a little "sticky" in regard to making arrangements for this project. Of course it is not difficult to understand why that would be the case.

In addition, the railroad there probably would have to be moved, at an estimated cost of approximately $5 million; but that additional cost is not included in the cost figures which have been submitted.

Of course all these additional costs would further reduce the alleged benefit-cost ratio, which—without including these additional costs—I charge should be assessed at 8 to 1.

As the previously mentioned table shows, the general taxpayers all over the country will pay between three-fourths and seven-eighths of the cost of this project. Essentially, this means a redistribution of income from taxpayers generally to a specific area in the State of Kansas. Although I recognize the meritorious character of the citizens of Kansas, I question whether Senators should vote to require their constituents—throughout the country—to pay some of their taxes to the residents of the State of Kansas, and especially when the Kansans who would be directly affected have emphatically shown that they do not want the project constructed. In that connection, I placed in the RECORD today the names and addresses of those who say they do not want the project constructed, and they are the only ones who could benefit from it and they are the ones whose farms would be irrigated. However, they have testified overwhelmingly that they do not want it.

Mr. President, I summarize as follows:

The proposed $76 million cost includes $17 million for irrigation. However, that irrigation would be of value only if it brought additional feed grains into production. On the other hand, we now have approximately $3 billion worth—$3,000 million—worth of feed grains which are in surplus supply, and we are spending approximately $1,300 million both in payments to keep land out of production and in payments for storage of the feed grains. Yet, as I have said,

$17 million of the total amount for this project—which, according to the Bureau of Reclamation, is divisible, and the $17 million can be taken off—would be for the exclusive purpose of bringing into production land on which more corn, rye, and other feed grains could be produced. But 90 percent of the farmers in the Solomon River Valley who allegedly would benefit from the project are opposed to it, and they own 85 percent of the land involved. In addition, 80 percent of the farmers in that area have signed petitions—and their signatures to them have been notarized—to the effect that they would not join any irrigation district which would irrigate their land.

In any case, Mr. President, if such an irrigation district were established, the result would be to increase the size of our surpluses of feed grains, as I have already documented and detailed.

As I have stated, the overall cost-benefit ratio is alleged to be 0.80 to 1, even if we assume that the feed grains would be worth something, although actually they would be worthless.

Finally, Mr. President, the project is improperly authorized. Neither the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs nor the Public Works Committee of either the House of Representatives or the Senate has ever considered the project in any detail. The only previous reference to it was a single line in the 1944 omnibus Pick-Sloan authorization, where the project is listed along with 325 other projects. Since that time, however, the cost of the project has more than tripled, and has now gone up to $75 million.

Furthermore, if it is desired to reduce flood losses in Kansas, it would be more efficient to build some of the alternative flood control projects which have much higher benefit-cost ratios. Such alternative projects would make much more sense.

This project, however, would affect only a small percent of the water that now flows into the area subject to flood losses. Furthermore, it is approximately 200 miles away from the main site to be protected. So in my opinion it makes no sense to state that this project would be the most efficient way to accomplish a flood control project.

Mr. President, on Monday I expect to call up both of these amendments; and I hope the Senate will support me in my effort to save $76 million for the taxpayers of the United States.

I yield the floor.

GRAVITY OF COTTON AND TEXTILE PROBLEM

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we are all acutely aware of the gravity of the cotton and textile problem.

We know the seriousness of it from our cotton farmers who struggle against overwhelming odds to eke out an existence in the production of this commodity which once was king in my region of the Nation, but which now has been virtually banished.

We know how critical the problem is when we see hundreds of textile mills closing down, throwing thousands out of work, or converting to synthetics, because they are unable to compete in world markets at world prices.

Why is this so? It is because of the inequitable two-price cotton system which allows foreign mills to buy U.S. cotton and to manufacture textile products much cheaper than can our own mills in this country.

Furthermore, we know from the taxpayers that our cotton program is long overdue for an overhaul. Our present cotton subsidy program costs about $1 billion a year, and only relatively few benefit from it.

Because the Government is engaged in such extraneous activities as buying, storing, transporting, selling and giving away cotton, we see an annual public outlay of more than a billion dollars, including subsidies and carrying charges.

This, then, is our present cotton program and, Mr. President, I submit that it makes absolutely no sense at all.

How much longer are we going to permit this situation to exist?

How much longer are we going to ignore this problem?

Piecemeal or stopgap legislation is not the answer. Nor is a new subsidy upon-a-subsidy program.

Mr. President, a fresh approach is needed, and anything short of a complete revision of the present program will only compound the problem.

I submit without fear of contradiction by textile manufacturers or farmers who want to get back in the business of free and competitive cotton production, that the compensatory payment plan as embodied in the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill is the most sensible and economical solution to this dilemma.

The Talmadge-Humphrey bill would do away with existing subsidies, thus eliminating the two-price cotton system, take the Government out of the business of buying, storing, transporting, selling and giving away cotton, revitalize our textile industry, and help those cotton farmers who most need assistance.

I urge the Senate to give close attention to the ailments of the cotton industry, and prescribe what I believe to be the only cure.

I have had occasion to read an editorial published in today's Wall Street Journal, entitled "Logic." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 6, 1963]

LOGIC

Problem: High price supports for growers price American cotton out of world markets.

Answer: Subsidize exporters so they can compete on the world market.

Problem: Foreign mills buy U.S. cotton at the subsidized export rate, make it into goods and sell them in this country, while U.S. mills have to pay the higher price-propped domestic rate.

Answer: Subsidize the U.S. mills by the somewhat oblique device of subsidizing cotton brokers. (The House has just voted to do just that.)

Problem: The foreigners might not like it.

Possible answer: Subsidize them. (We wouldn't be surprised; the United States already subsidizes practically everything on earth.)

Problem: What about the American consumer who gets triply of quadruply stung by this ferocious political logic?

Answer: Who cares? He doesn't have a lobby.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I also wish to call attention to an editorial entitled, "The Sad Cotton Dilemma," and a news analysis entitled, "Huge Textile Interests Wait Cotton Decision," both published in the Atlanta Journal of December 4, 1963, which point out the need for a new program.

I ask unanimous consent to have both the editorial and the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, Dec. 4, 1963]

THE SAD COTTON DILEMMA

Sentiment for the cotton bill now before Congress seems lukewarm at best and it would be our guess that this lack of enthusiasm extends even to many of the textile manufacturers it is designed to help.

Most of those who vote for it probably will be doing so only because they reason it's all they have and consider it better than nothing.

But why should they be forced into such a predicament when there were other bills, notably that of Senator TALMADGE, that would have come a lot closer to offering a fair solution to the cotton problem?

The bill which made it to the floor of Congress embodies Government subsidy for the textile industry. It's the contention of one opponent of the proposal that 34 textile mills would get 70 percent of the $292 million in subsidy payments, with one firm alone receiving $28 million.

Yet traditionally such large industrial enterprises have been violently opposed to Federal handouts. Once they get on the receiving end how can they maintain such a stance?

Still there is the contention that unless something is done to permit American mills to buy American cotton as cheaply as it can be purchased abroad, there's real uncertainty as to whether our mills can survive.

That's the impasse. It's a shame that more acceptable plans had to be sidetracked to make way for one that elicits such a mediocre response.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Dec. 4, 1963]

HUGE TEXTILE INTERESTS WAIT COTTON DECISION

Congress has got down to basics on the big cotton controversy of 1963, the hassle over what to do with the so-called two-price cotton system.

What Congress finally does will have an impact in Georgia's huge textile interests—from the farmer growing the cotton to the millowner weaving it into cloth. The taxpayer is also interested.

Georgia supplied more than one-tenth of the Nation's cotton in 1930. In 1961 the State supplied only 3.5 percent. Only about half of Georgia's cotton farmers actually planted any cotton last year.

The trouble in Georgia and the Nation, Congressmen have charged, is the present cotton subsidy program which costs about $1 billion a year.

Since 1956 the Federal Government has subsidized the export of cotton. The Government has paid 8.5 cents per pound on cotton shipped out of the Nation to bring its price down to 24 cents, the going world rate.

Domestic textile manufacturers have chafed under this system since shortly after

Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 6 (legislative day, DECEMBER 5), 1963
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 9140 making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 12, line 5, add the following: ": *Provided further*, That no funds in this bill for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes".

Amdt. No. 343

Amdt. No. 343 Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

AMENDMENT

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

DECEMBER 6 (legislative day, DECEMBER 5), 1963
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

DECEMBER 6 (legislative day, DECEMBER 5), 1963
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 11, line 18, change "$187,425,000" to "$182,425,000" and on page 12, line 5, insert the following: "*Provided:* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Glen Elder unit in Kansas."

Amdt. No. 344

Amdt. No. 344 Calendar No. 726

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

AMENDMENTS

Intended to be proposed by Mr. PROXMIRE to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

DECEMBER 6 (legislative day, DECEMBER 5), 1963
Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Dec. 10, 1963
For actions of Dec. 7 & 9, 1963
88th-1st; Nos. 200 and 201

CONTENTS

Adjourned.....2	Foreign aid.....4,15	Meat imports.....6,24
Appropriations..3,11,14,22	Foreign trade...8,25,26,29	Minerals.....13
Beef imports.....6,24	Forestry.....12,29	Public works.....3
Budgeting.....17	Grains.....8,9,25	Puerto Rico.....11
Cotton.....5,25	Information.....28	Reclamation.....16
Debt.....18	Lands.....1,12,19	River basins.....21
Electrification.....20,27	Law.....1	Soil survey.....19
Employment.....23	Loans.....27	Taxation.....18
Farming.....23	Legislative program..14,22	Water resources.....7
		Wheat.....8,9,25

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed public works appropriation bill. Senate considered conference report on foreign aid authorization bill. Sen. Talmadge urged enactment of Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill. Sen. Hruska spoke in support of restrictions on beef imports. Sen. McGovern urged enactment of voluntary wheat certificate legislation. Sen. Anderson and others commended recent enactment of water resources legislation. Sen. Proxmire urged concessions from Russia for any sale of grains. House agreed to conference report on foreign aid authorization bill.

HOUSE - Dec. 7

1. LANDS; LAW. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 8070, to establish a Public Land Law Review Commission to study existing laws and procedures relating to the administration of the public lands of the U.S. (H. Rept. 1008). p. 22783

2. ADJOURNED until Mon., Dec. 9. p. 22783

SENATE - Dec. 9

3. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 9140 (pp. 22674-702). Conferees were appointed (p. 22702). Agreed to the committee amendments en bloc (p. 22682). Rejected an amendment by Sen. Hruska

to strike out the $45 million for the accelerated public works program (pp. 22689-90). Rejected, 74 to 0, an amendment by Sen. Proxmire to provide that no funds for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes. Sen. Proxmire expressed concern that the additional irrigated lands would add to the feed grains surplus (pp. 22693-4).

As passed, the bill includes $45 million for the public works acceleration program. The committee report states that it is contemplated that $28,200,000 of this amount will be allocated to this Department. The committee report includes the following statements regarding comprehensive river basin studies:

"Although the committee supports the concept of comprehensive planning in the development of water and land resources for the long-range public good, it is appalled at the increase in the estimated costs of these studies and desires that the Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with the various departments involved, reevaluate the cost and the degree of refinement contemplated for these comprehensive basin studies."

"In the opinion of the committee, the cost of providing studies, of the scope presently proposed, for the rest of the country, is so staggering that it will require adoption of one of the following basic sources of action: (a) determination on the part of the Bureau of the Budget to recommend major increases in the amounts requested for all phases of water resource development, accompanied by an accelerated expansion of personnel in each bureau; (b) a major revision of the timetable previously approved for the accomplishment of the comprehensive studies, together with the establishment of some sort of priority system whereby certain river basins will be told they must wait 5, 10, 15 or 20 years for their survey; or (c) a change in the concept as to the details required for these comprehensive studies."

4. FOREIGN AID. Began consideration of the conference report on H. R. 7885, the foreign aid authorization bill. Sen. Morse termed the report "a shocking one which should be returned to conference." p. 22708

5. COTTON. Sen. Talmadge spoke in support of the Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill, expressed his "earnest hope that this bill can be substituted for the one passed by the other body," and inserted several items in support of his position. pp. 22672-3

6. BEEF IMPORTS. Sen. Hruska noted that beef and cattle are among the items listed for possible duty reductions during forthcoming tariff negotiations, stated that "it is ridiculous even to consider additional reductions in the tariff rates on cattle and beef," and inserted several items in support of his position. pp. 22666-70

7. WATER RESOURCES. Several Senators commended recent enactments of water resources legislation, and Sen. Anderson expressed gratification that the Senate has completed enactment of bills to "implement all of the major recommendations of the Select Committee on National Water Resources." pp. 22661-3

8. FOREIGN TRADE; GRAINS. Sen. Proxmire noted failures in Soviet agriculture, stated that "no wheat or other grain transactions should be made with the Soviet Union unless substantial concessions are obtained in return from the Soviet Union," and inserted an article, "A Red Crisis in Topsoil." pp. 22655-6

9. WHEAT. Sen. McGovern urged enactment of voluntary wheat certificate legislation "in advance of spring planting," and expressed pleasure that "four additional State Wheat Growers Associations last weekend endorsed the voluntary certificate approach." pp. 22665-6

no U.S. cotton would be sold abroad. It also is in addition to the parity payments to producers, thus creating a triple subsidy system.

It cannot be denied that the use of American cotton in American mills is in jeopardy unless something is done. Japanese and other foreign industries can buy our cotton so much cheaper than American mills that they can—with the further assistance of cheap labor—ship back the same cotton in finished form and undersell our own manufacturers. Such imported cotton fabrics now constitute 8 percent of our own national consumption.

Without relief, the textile industry in this country will turn to synthetic fibers, as much of it already has done, or will simply cease operations. In either event, U.S. cotton producers or U.S. millworkers or both are the losers. At a time when President Johnson insists that the national economy must be built up to support the creation of 5 million new jobs, we cannot afford to remain idle while the cotton industry is wrecked.

An alternative to the Cooley bill, however, promises a better and less expensive remedy. That is the bill introduced by Georgia's Senator HERMAN TALMADGE. Instead of loading still a third cotton subsidy onto the backs of the U.S. taxpayers, it would remove one of the two already in force.

The Talmadge bill would give each cotton farmer an allotment of a certain number of bales, rather than a certain number of acres. The total number of allotted bales would be based on domestic consumption. For the allotted bales, the farmer would be paid a subsidy to guarantee a minimum per-pound return. Each farmer would be permitted to grow as much cotton over the domestic allotment as he wished, but the overage would sell at the world price—almost certain to be a lower price, in view of production costs in Egypt and other cheap-labor countries.

The Talmadge bill would retain most of the protection now given the cotton producer, would relieve the American textile industry of its present unfair burden of discriminatory costs and would take much of the subsidy cost off the back of the public. It would get the Government out of the cotton surplus business. It would permit the big mass-production cotton planters of California with their mechanized low-cost methods to compete on the world market if they could economically do so.

The advantages of the Georgia Senator's bill so far outweigh those of the Cooley bill that the Senate should take a good, hard look at the consequences of each.

If the Senate also should approve the triple-subsidy Cooley proposal, however, it should be accepted only as an interim solution to give immediate relief to the textile industry, with the Talmadge plan remaining as a permanent and sensible system to be adopted as soon as possible.

[From the Augusta Chronicle, Dec. 6, 1963]

MORE THAN ONE BENEFICIARY

The House-passed cotton bill is far more than merely the windfall to domestic textile mills that it was charged with being during debate on the measure. It may be—or at least lead to a bill that will be—the redeemer of domestic cotton.

Undeniably the bill will prove to be a boon to American mills in their continuing economic battle with foreign competition. It will, if finally approved, enable the U.S. mills to purchase American cotton at the same price charged foreign mills. Currently, the differential is 8½ cents a pound, or about $40 a bale.

But that the domestic mills are going to gain 8½ cents on each pound of local cotton they buy does not, by an stretch of the imagination, mean that they are going to boost their profit by any fabulous amount.

What it means is that by purchasing American cotton at a price comparable to that paid for it by foreign mills, the local mills can reduce the cost of manufacture, price their cotton goods cheaper—and become more competitive on both the domestic and world market with foreign made goods.

Principal beneficiaries, however, are not just the mill owners. The consumers and, perhaps even more so, the cotton farmers themselves stand to be directly aided when the present two-price cotton system is replaced by a more equitable order.

For the consumer, the benefits will derive, obviously, from the reduction in the retail price of cotton fabrics and made-up garments.

The advantage to the farmer will be more subtle.

The loss he has been daily facing comes from the fact that in recent years the mills, all of which have been hurt unnecessarily by the two-price system, have been striving to overcome their losses by turning from cotton to synthetics. The situation, instead of easing, has continued to grow more acute.

By its action therefore, the House at long last has given recognition to the dismal fact that continuation of the two-price system is going to result in an increasing decline in the use by domestic mills of cotton. It is becoming less profitable to them with almost every passing day.

This reduction in the consumption of American cotton by American mills is bound to have its effect on cotton as a farm commodity. It could, conceivably, lead to its elimination as a major crop.

Therefore, while the House bill—named for Representative HAROLD COOLEY of North Carolina, its sponsor—leaves much to be desired, it is, we think, a step in the right direction. Left to the Senate now, if cotton is to be saved, is the job either of placing its stamp of approval on the Cooley measure, or coming up with its own ideas of what a cotton bill should be. It might very well, in fact, turn to the Talmadge farm plan as that best serving the interests of the Nation.

It will be interesting to see if that develops in the Senate.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Dec. 7, 1963]

TALMADGE'S PLAN IS BETTER

In moving toward elimination of this country's two-price cotton system, the House Wednesday passed what is commonly known as the Cooley bill. Named for its sponsor, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, of North Carolina, the measure in essence, is, while better than none at all, an agricultural hodgepodge and a political expedient designed to please all cotton interests and do everything for everybody.

In the main, as we explained yesterday, the measure provides some surcease for the American textile mills. Under terms of the bill, they would be permitted to purchase domestic cotton at the world price and thereby become competitive with foreign concerns which currently are permitted to buy American cotton at some $46 a bale cheaper than do the American firms. We firmly believe they should be permitted this privilege.

In order to do this, however, the COOLEY bill provides what foes claim is a triple subsidy. There already is an 8½-cent-a-pound subsidy given cotton shippers in order that they may meet the world price of 24 cents and permit the sale of American cotton abroad. In addition, the Government aids the cotton farmers by way of parity payments. Now, say opponents, the assistance to the domestic mills would amount to another 8½-cent subsidy.

Stiff opposition for the measure, which passed the House by a vote of 216 to 182, is seen when it is called up in the Senate. In fact, Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee, has expressed open antagonism. "I can't support a cotton bill which would greatly increase costs of the farm program * * *," he said.

The additional increase has been estimated to be some $600 million in 3 years, although COOLEY insists the figure is nearer $118 for the first year, and less in succeeding years.

As we said yesterday, this opposition in the Senate may cause that body to turn to the farm plan of Senator HERMAN TALMADGE, of Georgia, as one that is better for the Nation.

We think it would be.

In the first place, the Talmadge plan, while also helping the domestic mills, would be more economical, both as a program for the Government and as a burden for the taxpayers than will be the Cooley bill.

It calls for domestic prices to drop to world levels—some 8½ cents less—and then provide Government payments to farmers to bring them up the U.S. support level. The subsidies would be designed to bring farmers' income up to figures comparable to workers, in other fields of endeavor.

Primarily, however, the Talmadge plan would get the Government out of the cotton surplus business. It would eliminate all acreage controls and would assign each farmer a domestic production quota based on bales. The latter number would be based upon domestic consumption. For his allotment, the farmer would be paid a subsidy guaranteeing to him a minimum per-pound return. He could grow as much cotton as he wished, but would be compelled to sell the overage at the world price, which, in light of cheaper production costs overseas, could be expected to be well below the price guaranteed under his production quota.

Additionally, it would take the Federal Government out of the business of buying, transporting, storing and selling all farm commodities. A savings of $8 billion for the storage of farm surpluses has been estimated by Senator TALMADGE as one of the advantages accruing to the taxpayers if his bill is ultimately adopted.

Support for the Cooley bill came from the administration, which saw it as the best bill possible to please all interests in the cotton business. It has had the support of the mills because they, by and large, didn't feel the Talmadge bill could be enacted, even though they may have preferred it.

Farm groups, ironically, have been the chief opponents to the Talmadge plan. Because it would provide direct subsidies to them, many farmers have felt—especially those who would receive large amounts—that the Government would take a look at the payments—and then vote to place a lower ceiling on them.

Under the Cooley bill the Government support prices are in the form of loans on cotton placed in Government warehouses.

TRIBUTE TO MATHIAS F. CORREA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this morning in Arlington National Cemetery was buried Mathias F. Correa, a great contributor to the public and military life of our Nation for the past quarter of a century.

He was appointed, prior to World War II and at just past 30 years of age to the office of U.S. attorney for the southern district of New York.

He sought to put on the uniform as soon as he could, leaving that job to become a lieutenant in the Army and was sent to the Mediterranean theater. He transferred to the Marine Corps, and became special assistant to the Secretary

of the Navy, James Forrestal. He gave strength and depth to Secretary Forrestal's office and contributed a great deal to the success of the Secretaryship of Mr. Forrestal.

Following the war, he continued to be interested in public life, playing a definitive role in setting up the present Central Intelligence Agency as one of the three citizens, along with William H. Jackson and Allen W. Dulles, who drafted the original blueprints for the Central Intelligence Agency.

Over the years, along with his demanding private work, he retained an interest in our Government.

In fact, if the ideas he had advanced and believed in in 1948 had been fully carried out and implemented by the Central Intelligence Agency, many problems could have been avoided.

He also continued in the Marine Corps, which enjoyed his loyalty and affection throughout his life.

This grand gentlemen was buried today in the national cemetery of the Government he served so well.

His lovely widow, his devoted mother, his three wonderful daughters, and his many friends are and will be immensely sad at his loss.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order agreed to this morning, the Chair now lays before the Senate H.R. 9140, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Senate has for consideration today the public works appropriation bill. I am very hopeful that consideration of the bill can be concluded this afternoon, so that, as soon as possible, we may go to conference with the House on the disagreeing amendments.

I regret that again this year the public works appropriation bill is being considered at the tail end of the session. The bill passed the House on November 19, and was referred to the Committee on Appropriations on November 20. The bill was reported to the Senate on December 5.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to give a lengthy explanation of the bill. The report on it is on the desks of the Senators, and I believe it quite clearly sets forth the action of the committee.

Except with respect to title IV, I believe the bill is noncontroversial. I expect that amendments will be offered to decrease or strike from the bill amounts recommended for public works acceleration.

At the conclusion of my statement, I will ask that the committee amendments be adopted en bloc and that the bill as thus amended be considered as original text, so that the Senate will have ample opportunity to work its will on the bill.

Mr. President, as is customary, the Subcommittee on Public Works divided itself into three subcommittees for the consideration of the pending bill. The portion of the public works appropriation bill dealing with the Bureau of Reclamation and the power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior was handled by my good and able friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. The portion of the bill covering the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority was handled by my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I handled the portion dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army, and the Public Works Acceleration Act.

The hearings on this bill started on May 7, and continued through November 20, 1963. The subcommittee held 54 sessions for the purpose of taking testimony, and 4 executive sessions for the purpose of marking up the bill. The subcommittee heard 1,059 witnesses, which included representatives of various organizations; 908 of the witnesses appeared before the subcommittee dealing with the civil functions of the Department of the Army; all but 16 of the remaining witnesses appeared before the subcommittee headed by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The hearings comprise 4 volumes, which contain 4,540 pages of testimony. Senators have a complete set of them on their desks. They constitute the basic information upon which the subcommittee based its recommendation to the full committee.

It is my belief that in the future the committee should, in a measure, curtail much of the repetitious testimony that is given from year to year on the continuing projects. Before hearings are started next year on the 1965 appropriation bill, I shall, in advance, ask witnesses to confine their testimony, more or less, to new matters that may be presented to the committee. So far as the testimony on projects that are in the process of being constructed is concerned, I believe it is repetitious for the committee to take the same testimony from year to year.

As Senators can see on their desks, the size of the printed record of hearings conducted this year is huge. All of that is costly. It is my belief that in the future it might be possible to curtail some of that expense. I do not believe the projects would suffer thereby.

Mr. President, with respect to title I, before marking up the civil functions portion of this bill, we reviewed every project that was presented to the subcommittee, budgeted or unbudgeted. We examined into every single request made of the subcommittee for planning or construction. After all the requests were made, Engineers were called back to obtain their views on the projects presented to the subcommittee. The purpose of this recall was to find out whether the Engineers could economically and efficiently utilize the additional funds requested by the local witnesses, and whether the Corps of Engineers had the capability to undertake the unbudgeted new starts requested.

As in the past, the subcommittee heard all the witnesses who desired to present testimony on unbudgeted projects, and also on budgets for which more funds were asked than were budgeted. The same is true of surveys and new planning starts. As in the past, there is not a single project that has been recommended by the subcommittee or by the committee as a whole for which there is not justification in the hearings before the Senate.

I am proud to say that the subcommittee has not included, either in this instance or in the past, any projects that were not completely justified by the Corps of Engineers, and as to which their capability was not clearly shown.

As to projects that were requested and that were budgeted, the subcommittee spent considerable time reviewing them with the Engineers.

The Senate has before it a complete justification for all planning and construction projects that were included in the bill by the Senate committee, and for all projects that were recommended by the House as well.

In order to balance the bill, and in order to take care of worthy areas not previously included in the bill, I recommended to the subcommittee the inclusion of a number of projects that had been requested by witnesses from all over the country, and by Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope that the Senate will agree to the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations and that it will be possible to retain the majority of the projects in the conference with the House.

As in the past, the committee has recommended some of the new projects, both construction and planning; and in a moment, I shall place in the RECORD, for the information of the Congress, a list of the new additions proposed by both the House and the Senate.

The House committee added, as I have just stated, 19 unbudgeted construction projects and 17 unbudgeted planning items. The House sent us a bill which on its face showed that title I was under the budget; but in order to attain that goal, the House reduced the budget for construction, general, by $32,318,300; of which $19,672,000 was an increase in the item reduction for savings and slippage, and $6,033,300 was a general reduction in estimates for recreation facilities.

I am not surprised by the action taken by the House, because the House has exercised that privilege in the past, by adding more for slippages than was provided by the Corps of Engineers. As we all know, many projects are delayed because the Engineers or the local people may have difficulty in obtaining sufficient land on which to build projects, or rights-of-way to construct roads. It is normal that over the years this slippage has amounted to from 4 to 5 percent of the overall amount provided by the bill. The House increased, percentagewise, this amount from a little under 5 percent to between 6 and 7 percent. In so doing, the House was able to accomplish what appears to be a more or less balanced budget; that is, the House bill was actually a few dollars under the budget. But that was accomplished by cutting 2½ to 3 percent further on slippages.

Restoration of the budget estimates accounts for $28,845,300 of the $51,573,300 increase recommended for construction generally.

The Senate committee recommended $2,143,000 for 28 unbudgeted planning items and $6,879,000 for 23 unbudgeted construction projects.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table explaining the committee action on title I printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the new Senate committee items, both planning starts and construction starts, and also the unbudgeted items of the House, for both construction and planning.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CONSTRUCTION STARTS ADDED BY HOUSE

Project	Total cost estimate	Appropriations to date	Amount allowed by House	Balance to complete	Project	Total cost estimate	Appropriations to date	Amount allowed by House	Balance to complete
Manicee Bayou, upstream extension, Arkansas	$673,000	$60,000	$200,000	$413,000	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo	$4,300,000	$1,184,000	$400,000	$2,716,000
Redwood City Harbor, Calif	670,000	10,000	660,000		Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H	7,520,000	120,000	1,000,000	6,400,000
Talchevak Creek, Calif	1,110,000	160,000	200,000	750,000	Buffalo Outer Harbor, N.Y	3,240,000	33,000	250,000	2,957,000
Savannah River below Augusta, Georgia and South Carolina	3,824,000	3,554,000	270,000		Ithaca Cayuga Inlet, N.Y	4,480,000	223,000	300,000	3,957,000
Coralville Reservation, Mehaffey Bridge, Iowa	1,220,000	82,000	150,000	988,000	Swift Creek, N.C	915,000	76,000	250,000	589,000
Rathbun Reservation, Iowa	23,600,000	555,000	400,000	22,645,000	Conneaut Harbor, Ohio	9,170,000	118,000	225,000	8,827,000
Saylorville Reservation, Iowa	36,500,000	700,000	400,000	35,400,000	Swinomish Slough, Wash	910,000	22,000	150,000	738,000
Narragus River, Maine	507,000	7,000	500,000		Washougal area	1,718,000	75,000	100,000	1,543,000
Gloucester Harbor, Mass	1,120,000	20,000	500,000	600,000	Kenosha Harbor, Wis	710,000	23,000	200,000	487,000
Muskegou Harbor, Mich	660,000	10,000	100,000	550,000	Total	102,847,000	7,032,000	[1] 6,257,000	89,560,000

NEW PLANNING STARTS ADDED BY HOUSE

Buchanan Reservoir, Calif	$14,600,000	$115,000	$125,000	$14,360,000	Manchester (deferred), Ohio	$1,330,000	$10,000	$8,000	$1,312,000
Dana Point Harbor, Calif	3,760,000	30,000	95,000	3,635,000	Copan Reservoir, Okla	26,500,000	22,000	100,000	26,378,000
Dubuque, Iowa	5,650,000	50,000	35,000	5,565,000	Raystown Reservoir, Pa	32,150,000	153,000	150,000	31,847,000
Boston Harbor, Chelsea River, Mass	2,516,000	16,000	40,000	2,460,000	Narragansett pier, Rhode Island	1,172,000	20,000	50,000	1,102,000
Plymouth Harbor, Mass	1,230,000	10,000	35,000	1,185,000	Point Judith hurricane harrier, Rhode Island	2,458,000	44,000	50,000	2,364,000
Oswego Harbor, N.Y	1,260,000	42,000	60,000	1,158,000	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway to Palacios, Tex	829,000	11,000	30,000	788,000
Rosendale, N.Y	2,450,000	37,000	100,000	2,313,000	Kickapoo River, Wis	16,800,000	158,000	50,000	16,592,000
Salamanca, N.Y	1,520,000	50,000	20,000	1,450,000	Total	145,850,000	877,000	1,098,000	143,875,000
Caesar Creek Reservoir, Ohio	14,410,000	23,000	75,000	14,312,000					
East Fork Reservoir, Ohio	17,215,000	86,000	75,000	17,054,000					

[1] Includes $18,000 in budget for planning Muskeyon Harbor, Mich.

New construction starts added by the Senate

Project	Total cost	Appropriated to date	Budget estimate	House amount	Senate amount	Balance to complete
Sitka Harbor, Crescent Bay Basin, Alaska	$965,000	$44,000			$921,000	
Garland City, Ark	948,000	230,000			250,000	$468,000
Noyo River and Harbor, Calif	13,500,000	75,000	(P) $150,000	(P) $150,000	(P) 150,000 (C) 100,000	13,175,000
Trinidad Reservoir, Colo	21,000,000	379,000	(P) 86,000	(P) 86,000	(P) 86,000 (C) 300,000	20,235,000
Connecticut River below Hartford, Old Sayhrook, Conn	581,000	3,000			(C) 578,000	
Palm Beach Harbor, Fla	5,120,000	110,000			250,000	4,760,000
Pensacola Harbor, Fla	447,000	23,000			299,000	125,000
Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee, Illinois	1,180,000	55,000			150,000	975,000
Rend Lake Reservoir, Ill	36,000,000	499,000	(P) 501,000	(P) 501,000	(P) 501,000 (C) 10,000	34,990,000
Tri Pond levee, Illinois	1,260,000	60,000			300,000	900,000
Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	61,300,000	425,000	(P) 20,000	(P) 200,000	(P) 200,000 (C) 750,000	59,925,000
Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier, Louisiana	3,340,000	90,000 9,000	(P) 103,000	(P) 103,000	(P) 103,000 (C) 47,000	3,181,000
Campti Clarence levee, Louisiana	1,320,000	70,000	(P) 23,000	(P) 23,000	(P) 23,000 (C) 100,000	1,127,000
Gladstone Harbor, Mich	812,000	15,000			200,000	597,000
Natchez, Miss	368,000	34,000			115,000	219,000
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo	140,000,000	1,155,000	(P) 650,000	(P) 650,000	(P) 650,000 (C) 350,000	137,845,000
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic River, North Reach Channel	1,532,000				400,000	1,132,000
Fort Macon Atlantic Beach, N.C	410,000	5,000			54,000	351,000
Bowman Haley Reservoir, N. Dak	2,810,000	195,000			300,000	2,315,000
Missouri River bank stabilization below Garrison Dam, N. Dak	3,000,000				300,000	2,700,000
Tacoma Harbor, Wash	2,480,000	21,000			150,000	2,309,000
East Lynn Reservoir, W. Va	14,000,000	120,000	(P) 280,000	(P) 280,000	(P) 280,000 (C) 220,000	13,380,000
Snagging and clearing	750,000				750,000	
Total	313,123,000	3,527,000		1,993,000	8,887,000	300,709,000
Senate increase					6,894,000	

New planning starts added by the Senate

Project	Total cost	Appropriated to date	Budget estimate	Senate amount	Balance to complete
Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss	$263,000,000	$1,491,000		$225,000	$1,269,000
McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas	251,000	5,000		44,000	302,000
Village Creek, White River and Mayberry Levee District, Arkansas	1,371,000	45,000		75,000	1,251,000
Corte Madera Creek, Calif	5,780,000	78,000		20,000	5,682,000
Mormon Slough, Calif	2,060,000	40,000		50,000	1,970,000
Santa Barbara Harbor, Cali	3,080,000	40,000		50,000	2,990,000
New London barrier, Connecticut	2,431,000	30,000		50,000	2,351,000
Kaunakakai Harbor, Hawaii	7,970,000	44,000		100,000	7,826,000
Chicago Harbor (1962 act), Ill	1,560,000	15,000		27,000	1,518,000
Island levee, Indiana and Illinois	1,780,000	12,000		50,000	1,718,000
Big Hill Reservoir, Kans	4,100,000	35,000		35,000	4,030,000
Kansas City, Kans	19,100,000	17,000		50,000	19,033,000
Merriam, Kans	992,000	10,000		50,000	932,000
Eagle Creek Reservoir, Ky	10,790,000	20,000		100,000	10,580,000
Ontonagon Harbor, Mich	5,070,000	29,000		75,000	4,966,000
Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev	2,840,000	40,000		100,000	2,700,000
New Hope Reservoir, N.C	25,293,000	150,000		180,000	24,963,000
Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 48-foot depth (1962 act), North Carolina	6,400,000	28,000		135,000	6,237,000
Cleveland Harbor, deepen east basin, Ohio	1,580,000	43,000		27,000	1,510,000
Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	68,600,000	50,000		150,000	68,400,000
Hugo Reservoir, Okla	4,900,000	5,000		100,000	4,795,000
Gate Creek Reservoir, Oreg	19,400,000	98,000		100,000	19,202,000
Shelton Ditch, Oreg	1,860,000	6,000		10,000	1,844,000
Muddy Creek Reservoir, Pa	7,640,000	49,000		25,000	7,566,000
Lake Kemp Reservoir, Tex	8,600,000	52,000		50,000	8,498,000
North Fork Reservoir, Tex	13,100,000	10,000		50,000	13,040,000
Beech Fork Reservoir, W. Va	11,400,000	19,000		150,000	11,231,000
Green Bay Harbor, Wis	4,420,000	14,000		50,000	4,356,000

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a table explaining the committee action on title I.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Title I—Civil functions, Department of the Army

Cemeterial expenses			$10,800,000
The House amount, and $46,000 below the budget.			
No restoration requested.			
Corps of Engineers:			
General investigations			20,625,000
Above the budget		$565,000	
Above the House		2,625,000	
Above 1963		2,525,000	
Construction, general			849,856,000
Restoration of House cut, including $25,705,000 for slippage	$28,845,300		
28 new planning starts	2,143,000		
23 new construction starts	[1] 6,879,000		
18 budgeted construction items raised	13,731,000		
2 budgeted planning items raised	[2] 175,000		
1 House increase reduced	−200,000		
	51,573,300		
Above the budget		$30,370,000	
Above the House		51,573,300	
House compared with the budget:			
17 New planning starts	$1,098,000		
19 New construction starts	[3] 6,257,000		
2 increases in budget planning	100,000		
3 increases in budget construction	3,900,000		
9 Budget items reduced	−32,318,300		
	−20,963,300		
Corps of Engineers—Continued			
Operation and maintenance			$157,368,000
The budget estimate—			
Above the House		$7,368,000	
General expenses			15,000,000
Below the budget		$252,000	
The amount allowed by House—			
Above 1963		834,800	
Mississippi River and tributaries			80,406,000
Above the budget		$5,546,000	
Above the House		5,906,000	
U.S. section, St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers			10,000
Not included in the budget this year, since it was expected that the Board's work would be concluded in fiscal year 1963. The full amount is reimbursed to the United States by the New York State Power Authority.			
Canal Zone Government:			
Operating expenses			25,725,000
Below the budget		$740,000	
Above the House		725,000	
Above 1963		2,319,350	
Capital outlay			7,250,000
The budget estimate—			
Above the House		$750,000	
Above 1963		4,130,000	

[1] New future construction commitment, $300,709,000.
[2] Budget estimate received Dec. 4, 1963, for 1 item covering $150,000 of this increase, S. Doc. No. 45, 88th Cong., 1st sess.
[3] New future commitment, $89,560,000.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the budget estimates provided for 27 new planning starts and 34 new construction starts. I commend the administration for taking such action. The projects recommended are all necessary, and it is essential that each year an adequate number of new planning and construction projects be added to the program if the national needs for the development of our water resources are to be met in an orderly and efficient manner.

Mr. President, the House inserted language in the bill this year requiring the Panama Canal Company to obtain approval of the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate prior to the disposal or transfer by license, lease, or otherwise, except to another agency of the U.S. Government, any real property or rights to the use of real property.

A bill intended to accomplish essentially the same purpose, H.R. 3999, passed the House of Representatives and is now pending consideration in the Armed Services Committee of the Senate. The House report on that bill, Report No. 363, states in part:

It is not the intent of the bill to interfere with the ordinary functioning of the Panama Canal Company as a business enterprise, but it is intended solely to prevent discontinuance of activities or divestment of assets which will have a major impact upon the operations of the company as a business enterprise.

In recommending retention of the House language, we contemplate an interpretation of the language which would be consistent with the position taken by the legislative committee of the House which reported H.R. 3999. Certainly, neither the Governor of the Canal Zone nor the legislative committees referred to want to have the language interpreted in such a strict sense that the approval of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House would be required in order to grant a permit for the Elks to erect a clubhouse in the Canal Zone. It is not intended that the language in the bill apply to churches, recreational and fraternal organizations, employees' organizations, or other similar entities authorized to conduct their activities in the Canal Zone.

TITLE II

Mr. President, title II deals primarily with reclamation projects. As I have said, it was handled before the committee by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The budget estimates in the amount of $455,285,000 were considered by the committee for the activities and programs of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration. The committee recommends an appropriation of $420,290,200 for these purposes. This is $8,580,500 over the House allowance of $411,709,700, but is $34,994,800 less than the budget esti-

mates. The committee recommendation exceeds appropriations for fiscal year 1963 by $16,661,900.

The bill, in conformity with the budget proposals, includes the following new reclamation starts: Arbuckle project, Oklahoma; Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado; Rio Grande project recreational facilities, New Mexico; Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oregon; and Spokane Valley project, Washington-Idaho. In addition these new starts in the Colorado River storage project are provided: Lyman, San Juan-Chama, and Silt participating projects. And provision is included for commencement of an extra-high-voltage electrical interconnection between the Columbia River Basin and the Hoover Dam powerplant. Construction of this line will not begin until the Northwest power preference bill is enacted into law.

Budget estimates for the Bureau of Reclamation totaled $370,347,000. The committee recommends $356,223,200, which is $14,123,800 less than the budget and $8,076,500 more than the House allowed. Over $4,500,000 of the amount above the House allowance is accounted for by a restoration of the increased slippage reduction made by the House.

There is a small increase of $204,000 over the House allowance, in the amount approved for Bonneville Power Administration construction. This is accounted for primarily by adjustment of proposed construction items. Most of the reduction from the budget estimate—$20,283,000—was either suggested by the Department, or was not appealed by the Department from the results of the House action.

The Southeastern Power Administration, under the committee recommendation, will receive the full amount of the budget estimate; and only $588,000 less than the budget request is proposed for the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE III

Mr. President, the committee recommended $2,868,658,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Delaware River Basin Commission. The committee recommendation is $102,334,000 above the House allowance, $61,427,000 below the budget, and $331,047,610 below the appropriation for 1963.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

For operating expenses, the committee recommended an increase of $61,355,000, of which $18,500,000 was for the reactor development program; $12 million was for physical research; $7 million for biology and medicine; $1,500,000 for training, education, and information; $500,000 for the isotopes development program; $3,500,000 for civilian applications of nuclear explosives; $1,355,000 for program direction and administration; and $17 million for change in selected resources. For plant and capital equipment, the committee recommended an increase of $38,695,000, including a restoration of $20 million for slippage, and $17,945,000 for weapons construction projects in connection with safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty; and the remaining $750,000 was for the community building at Los Alamos.

For the Tennessee Valley Authority, the committee restored the House cut in the budget estimate.

The committee recommended no change in the amount provided by the House for the Delaware River Basin Commission.

TITLE IV

A moment ago, I referred to title IV. The committee recommended $45 million for the public works acceleration program.

It will be recalled that last year Congress passed an authorization bill for $900 million for a public works acceleration program; and last session $450 million was provided in order to make a start on this program. In the supplemental bill passed early this session $400 million was added, leaving a total of $50 million, under the authorization bill, that was not appropriated. Last month Mr. Batt, who heads this agency, appeared before the committee and asked that $45 million be included in this bill, in order to continue this public works acceleration program. Hearings were held; and as I have said, the committee recommended the appropriation of $45 million.

The Bureau of the Budget was a little late in sending its recommendations to Congress. When the matter was presented to the House committee, it did not hold hearings on this item. I do not know whether that was because of lack of time, or just what the reason was. However, the House considered it without having held any hearings, and decided to eliminate it from the bill and not to provide any funds whatever for it.

The Senate committee did the reverse; and after holding hearings, the Senate committee voted to provide for the $45 million requested. The request was justified on the basis of allocating $28,200,000 to the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture; $3 million to the Bureau of Land Management, $4 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, $4 million to the National Park Service, and $3,100,000 to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife—a total of $14,100,000 to these bureaus in the Department of the Interior. The balance of $2,700,000 has been reserved for administration.

The all Federal programs were proposed because of the short leadtime required in placing these programs underway. During the hearings it was also stressed that projects of this type could be carried on during the winter months when other types of construction work could not be performed. The committee felt, however, that half of the funds provided should be allocated for community facilities where the Federal funds are augmented by the utilization of local funds for the construction of urgently needed community facilities; and the committee so recommended. I am sure that we are all aware of the large backlog of requests made and applications pending with the Community Facilities Administration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that while the $45 million would be apportioned almost entirely, if not entirely, to Federal projects, those projects do lie in depressed areas in which there is heavy unemployment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; that would be the purpose. As Mr. Batt testified, the idea was to provide funds for projects which could immediately be used to relieve unemployment in the areas where the funds would be used.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. That was my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. That was the burden of the testimony given by Mr. Batt. The committee went on record as suggesting to Mr. Batt that at least half the amount should be used for community facilities projects in the various localities in which public works had been authorized—that is, the construction of various projects in cities, such as sewer systems, water projects, and so forth. But we did not include such a provision in the law itself. It is really optional with Mr. Batt to do what we suggest, or to proceed as he said he would—that is, to use the entire amount for projects that will relieve unemployment in many areas in which there is a serious situation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that half the total sum would be used for what are called community facilities in depressed areas?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. As the Senator knows, there is a formula in the bill which directs how the funds should be used. I asked Mr. Batt specifically whether he would be in violation of the act by proposing to do what he contemplated. His answer was that he could use all the funds as he proposed, because, as the Senator knows, the main purpose of the program is to relieve unemployment in places where it is acute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding that the $45 million would come out of the unappropriated balance remaining under the act that was passed last year, and there would still be left about $5 million unappropriated out of the authorization?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I commend the Appropriations Committee for its action in reference to the $45 million item which has been under discussion. I am grateful, also, for the understanding of the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] who has been patient, diligent and cooperative with Members in his management of this important measure. He has been thorough. His advocacy of this appropriation for the accelerated public works program is appreciated.

That the RECORD may be perhaps supplemented at this point, I wish to say that not only has the need of this item to further the attack on unemployment been great, not only has the need been

met only in part, but we feel that the effort to meet the needs of the economy and the people of eligible areas must be continued in the months ahead.

Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock a special subcommittee of the Public Works Committee will begin hearings on legislation to authorize extension and further expenditures under the accelerated public works program.

I bring this to the attention of Senators to indicate that there will be in Washington this week officials and citizens from municipalities and from other political subdivisions who will testify concerning the need for a continuing program. There is still too much unemployment and too many unmet public facility needs in many sections of the country.

Again I compliment the committee, and I commend its chairman and the managers and diligent and efficient staff members who have brought to the Senate a meaningful and vitally important measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what the Senate will do in the future, but I was more or less interested in carrying out what Congress undertook to do in the past. I believe we should appropriate the balance of the authorization in the measure enacted last year. As to what Congress will do in the future, I do not know. But from past experience, we know that when programs start, there is a demand to continue them. The testimony revealed that the total of the applications which have been made to Mr. Batt exceeds $1 billion. Many communities bonded themselves and raised money in order to be able to contribute and be eligible for money under the program. I believe they went far afield in doing so without the Congress having voted the necessary additional funds.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I commend the Senator for bringing before the Senate the appropriation bill. It is an important part of the public works program, and represents a capital investment in the future of our country.

I should like particularly to refer to title IV. I notice that the Department of Agriculture would receive $28,200,000. Will the Senator tell me in what type of projects the Department of Agriculture intends to engage?

Mr. ELLENDER. That amount is for reforestation in parts of our country in which there is a good deal of unemployment. We were told that it would be used for that purpose and in areas where it will also serve to relieve unemployment

Mr. CARLSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The report states that Federal funds will be augmented by utilization of local funds. Would that statement also be true in respect to Department of Agriculture projects?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; that would not be true, because the agriculture projects are all Federal.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. First, I commend the Senator for his usual painstaking task. I was interested in what he said in the earlier part of his remarks about the voluminous hearings, and his intention to try to bring a cessation to the redundant hearings which have been held on projects underway.

I am afraid that I have been as guilty as some other Senators in bringing delegations before him. I sympathize thoroughly with his position. The chairman has been most patient. In many cases he has probably known the subject better than many witnesses whom we brought in as proponents of the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is because I listened to them so often that I learned something.

Mr. MORTON. I assure the Senator that he will have my cooperation in the future on this subject. I believe his point is well taken. As one who has had the privilege of appearing before the chairman, both as a Member of the House and as a Member of this body, I have always found him to be fair, thorough, and perhaps the most painstaking man in this important area who has ever served in Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is very kind to make that statement.

Mr. MORTON. I mean it.

Mr. ELLENDER. A moment ago, when I made the statement about curtailing the size of the hearings, I did not mean to cut off anyone, but I am certain that——

Mr. MORTON. Even Job's patience was finally exhausted.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that if last year's and this year's hearings were analyzed, the Senator would find a great deal of repetition.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. A short while ago there was a colloquy between the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in which it was developed that from the $45 million, if appropriated for accelerated public works, $28 million would be allocated for the Department of Agriculture. If the language in the Senate report will have any efficacy at all, there will be a proportionate adjustment in that $28 million, I presume.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. As was suggested by the Senator, one-half of the $45 million should go for community facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. I wish to place that correction in the RECORD at this time.

The amount will have to be apportioned. If the money were apportioned, half of it would be spent on a more or less matching basis.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate very much the explanation which has been made. I caught this item as I glanced through the report, and I wondered how it would be handled.

Mr. ELLENDER. When Mr. Batt appeared before us, he was desirous of spending the money through the Federal Government in places where unemployment could be relieved and where many people could be employed directly so that the unemployment could be relieved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has the Senator completed his remarks?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I have not concluded them yet.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Then I will wait until the Senator has concluded his remarks.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to discuss with the Senator the subject of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and especially the testimony dealing with that subject which appears on pages 1408 and thereafter on part I of the testimony.

Tomorrow hearings will begin to ascertain the situation prevailing in the operation of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I observe from the hearings that the Senator asked the St. Lawrence Seaway representatives certain questions. Am I correct in my understanding that the use of the St. Lawrence Seaway is less, in terms of tonnage, than was originally estimated?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 1408 of the hearings the statement is made:

> According to the original Tolls Committee estimates, our tonnage for 1962 should have been 37 million as shown on this chart. The cumulative yearly total lag of actual tonnages in comparison with the estimated tonnages amounts to 34 million.

So the actual tonnage was 3 million less than anticipated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Since the tonnage was less than anticipated, there was an adverse impact upon the ability of the corporation to pay not only the amount needed for amortization of the bonds, but also the interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I turn now to page 1408 of part I of the testimony. It shows that for the year 1963 Mr. Jose testified that the revenues would be about $3.8 million, with an interest obligation of $4.4 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am following the Senator. That is in the record.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So there is $600,000 less than is needed to pay the interest obligation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Of course, that is bound to come about because of a lower tonnage going through the canal than was anticipated.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How is the deficit made up? Is it made up through an appropriation bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; no money is appropriated for this purpose. The funds required to pay the interest, at the normal rate, and to pay whatever interest amount is due each year comes from corporation funds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How is that done? Does the Government guarantee the bonds?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is paid out of tolls. I am sure the Government supports the bonds; otherwise, they would not be purchased. I presume in time, if the revenues for the project continue to decrease, or are not sufficient to pay the outstanding bonds or interest, Congress may have to do something about it. Not only will our Congress have to do something about it, but Canada will have to do something about it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Canada is in the same position. Canada's engineering estimates were overoptimistic, and the income now is less than was anticipated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So if this Government is $600,000 in arrears in the payment of interest, the United States, owing only three-tenths of the debt, and Canada owing seven-tenths of the debt, Canada would be approximately twice as much in the red on their interest payments.

Mr. ELLENDER. I would not be able to state the facts with respect to Canada. Canada may have had some traffic in the interior which resulted in higher revenue to her than we received. As the Senator knows, all the traffic that passes through our part of the Canal comes from abroad. It is possible that inside Canada there is some traffic for which Canada receives tolls, and the United States does not. I have no knowledge of that.

If the same pattern is followed in Canada as in the U.S. part of the canal, there is no doubt that Canada's lack of funds will be in the same proportion to her investment as the deficit on the U.S. portion has been.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I direct the Senator's attention to page 1414, which sets forth the narrative statement—I read from the second paragraph under the subhead "Capital outlay":

> The total construction cost of the U.S. share of the seaway is estimated at $132.4 million. Work in place at the end of the current year 1963 is estimated at $131.2, and the budget year 1964 program to complete the project is estimated at $1.2 million.

That $132.4 million equals three-tenths of the cost of the seaway. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. That is my information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I substantially correct that the total cost was $400,410,000?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; for the navigation portion. As the Senator knows, there is a power project on the river. I think it was constructed jointly by the State of New York and the power entity of the Province of Ontario, Canada. The cost the Senator has mentioned does not cover that power feature of the project. It is being financed through the sale of electricity that is sold from the hydroelectric plant constructed by the State of New York and Ontario Hydroelectric.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Can the Senator give me an estimate of the cost of building the navigable system on the Arkansas River through Arkansas and into Oklahoma when it will be fully completed?

Mr. ELLENDER. The estimate at the moment, including the power dams, and storage for flood control as well as the locks for the purpose of navigation is in the neighborhood of $1 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not intended to have tolls charged to ships that will use that navigable stream.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. That has been the policy of this Government from time immemorial, so far as I know.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is there any other river or river basin in the United States where tolls are charged to ships that use the river, except in the case of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know of any. As I stated a moment ago, that is so because of the agreement between the United States and Canada. I assume that if the canal were totally within the United States, tolls would not be charged. In accordance with past policy, that project would have been constructed by the U.S. Government and be toll free.

Mr. LAUSCHE. For probably two decades efforts were made to have the Congress improve the St. Lawrence Seaway so it would be navigable, but the proponents were unable to muster the necessary votes. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. When does the Senator mean?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Prior to the time it was decided to build the Seaway on a self-liquidating basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Prior to that time I think the reason the Senate rejected the proposal to construct the St. Lawrence Seaway was that the cost was to be in excess of $1 billion, and the United States was to have borne most of the cost, while most of the Seaway was to be located in Canada. That is why there was so much opposition to construction of the project. It would have been almost totally in Canada, but financed entirely by the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I was interested in the statement made by the Senator to the effect that if the revenues were not adequate to pay off the obligations of interest and principal, eventually something would have to be done, especially if increasing the rates did not produce revenues necessary to amortize the debt.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain that if the tonnage increases, it will not be necessary to do anything. The past history of all these navigation projects has shown that the tonnage always increases. I could cite the Senator any number of projects constructed in the United States with respect to which that was true.

So far as Canada is concerned, I do not know that she uses the same yardstick we do. As the Senator knows, a very small part of the canal itself is in the United States. I do not want to criticize what the Canadians have done, but they may have been overoptimistic as to the tonnage that would pass through the waterway. If the tonnage does not increase, I believe it will be incumbent on the Canadian Government and the United States to get together and increase the tolls, so that revenues will be sufficient to meet principal and interest on the outstanding bonds. I believe the Canadian Government will do so. In the past I do not believe she has been as liberal as we have in providing toll-free projects in that country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The reason why I asked the question is that I have received letters complaining of the huge sums of money that are being spent in the development of navigable streams all over the United States, without tolls being charged; but on this river, serving the Midwest and the Great Lakes States, tolls are charged. It seems to me there is logic in the question. Why tolls only on the St. Lawrence Seaway when everywhere else there are no tolls? I refer especially to the Arkansas project, which is to cost $1.1 billion, which will go through Arkansas and into Oklahoma, and on which no tolls will be charged.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to my good friend that the Arkansas River navigation system is wholly within the United States. With respect to the St. Lawrence Seaway, Canada was unwilling to put up the money in order to make it toll free. As I remember, the only way in which the program could be constructed was to agree to the proposal of Canada that it be self-liquidating.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that to be the fact. Canada insisted that the St. Lawrence Seaway be self-liquidating.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That still does not destroy the feeling of many people in the Midwest that they are compelled to pay tolls in other places while they have free use of their navigable streams.

Mr. ELLENDER. I invite the attention of my good friend from Ohio to the fact that in addition to the money spent jointly by Canada in constructing that part of the seaway at Masenna, N.Y., and in the St. Lawrence area.

The U.S. Government is engaged in building connecting channels in the Great Lakes totally within the United States. The cost of such construction is currently estimated at $125,300,000, and will be spent to make that part of the route entirely toll free.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; that refers to the dredging of harbors, and things of that kind, I understand.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of that will be done at the expense of the Federal Government, without any charge being made to the users of the completed projects. The reason is that the projects are wholly within the United States, and they follow a pattern that has been followed almost from time immemorial in contsructing navigation projects, entirely with Federal funds, without any tolls being charged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. President Eisenhower recommended that the moneys expended to make inland waterways navigable should be recouped to the Treasury through the imposition of user charges. Some day that will have to come about, especially in connection with projects of the type we have described, costing $1,100 million on the Arkansas River, for example.

Mr. ELLENDER. I point out—and I am not saying this boastfully—that for the past 10 years, ever since I became chairman of the subcommittee, the subcommittee was instrumental in providing funds to reconstruct the locks on the Ohio River.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I remember, 10 locks have been built without a budget estimate. We were opposed at the time by the railroads, because it was felt by the railroads that a large part of their business would be taken away from them. However, the railroads are now finding out that the cheapest method of transporting bulk products or commodities is by water. There are developing in the Senator's State, in Ohio, as well as in Indiana and in Kentucky, industries, which are taking advantage of the pools of water which are being formed upstream from these dams, which furnish a great deal of fresh water. It is my information that many new industries have been established in those areas. The railroads find now that they are benefiting greatly by being able to transport the finished products, which, as the Senator knows, pay higher freight rates than do the bulk products.

Mr. LAUSCHE. We are getting into another subject. I should like to discuss it, but that is another subject. The point is that the railroads have been asking for the right to carry bulk products without regulation in the same manner as carriers on the inland waterways are now permitted to do. Congress, however, has refused to give the railroads the same right.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was not my intention to discuss this program. The only thing I was trying to point out to the Senator was what our policy was, what it has been, and what it is hoped it will be in the future. I believe it would be a grave mistake to place tolls on all our navigable rivers and streams on which we have constructed projects to aid navigation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My own belief is that there is no justification for subsidizing inland water carriers at the expense of other carriers. I concur in what President Kennedy recommended, that efforts be made to recoup the subsidies that were being granted to the airlines and inland water carriers, and to truckers on the basis of building highways for truckers, to which purpose the general taxpayer is contributing and to which the owners of passenger cars are contributing. I believe an effort should be made to revise the entire program.

Mr. ELLENDER. The railroads were subsidized to the nth degree when they were first constructed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Federal Government gave millions of dollars worth of property to the railroads, which has since been sold in many instances. Much of the revenue was used in the construction of railroads. I do not believe the railroads have lost anything. Some of them still own a good deal of land.

I do not want to go into that program, but it strikes me that it is essential to our future development to continue the program of utilizing the water resources of the Nation for navigation and for many other purposes, such as for hydroelectric power, and things of that kind. We have been neglecting that resource too long. That is why I have given so much time to trying to continue these studies.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator has been very generous in recommending funds for the Ohio River. I appreciate it. Of course there is money in the bill for other States, such as Pennsylvania, for example, as well as for Ohio along the river.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; for all the States. The Senator knows that land and water are among our greatest resources. The only way to improve such resources is by building the dams that are now being constructed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree that it should be done. However, I repeat that someday there will have to be a review of all the subsidy programs, not only with respect to ships on navigable streams, but also with respect to the airlines. The trucks have already been compelled to pay a share through excise taxes on accessories and tires, for example. The general taxpayer ought not to pay for the purpose of subsidizing these operations.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. To supplement the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I say to my good friend from Ohio that there is much to be said in support of the program that is underway in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

In the first place, those who advocated it most actively in the form in which it was adopted came from the very area of the country which is now being served by it; namely, the Midwest.

The Senator from Florida was one of those who supported the authorization and, later, he handled in the Appropriations Committee the items affecting the seaway.

He attended the dedication of the Seaway, representing the Senate. He is strongly for it.

But I call attention to the fact that there would not have been a St. Lawrence Seaway if it had not been for the very strong advocacy of the program by Senators and Representatives speaking for and representing the people of the great Midwest, who, in effect, were placed upon the Atlantic by means of its construction.

The second point I wish to make is that the Seaway provides a two-way movement. Those who were for it were not only speaking in behalf of moving their products, notably grain, but were speaking in support of their need for iron ore from Labrador, in order that the great steel centers should not have to be displaced. They were extremely anxious, in view of the approaching depletion of the great ore fields in Minnesota, to have the St. Lawrence waterway completed for that purpose.

As a third matter—and I have been down along the St. Lawrence since the seaway was opened—they were very anxious to have winter travel. I visited one of the great granaries at Baie Comeau, in Upper Quebec Province, where grain is taken down the seaway and stored during the warm portion of the year. Ships can now come to Baie Comeau all year because the river is not frozen below that point. So the people of the Midwest were very active in behalf of that program, and accomplished it.

This was truly an international project. To have constructed a canal either all in Canada or all in the United States would have cost billions of dollars. The way to do it reasonably was to construct that part in the United States where relatively cheap construction was possible, and to do the same thing in the larger mileage which lies within Canada. Canada insisted upon tolls not only because Canada was not able to meet its proportionately greater investment without having some repayment, but also because it had a competing canal or canals, as to a part of the route of the seaway, on which tolls were charged.

So every aspect of this project was carefully thought out in the legislative committees and on the floor of each House. The Senator from Florida did not support the program when he first came to the Senate, but after thorough consideration of it, he concluded that it was the right thing to do, changed his position, and became a strong advocate of it. He is well familiar with what happened at that time. He supports the chairman of the committee now in his statement that it was a good arrangement. It was the only arrangement that could be devised that was practical. It was reasonable then, and is still reasonable.

The Senator from Florida hopes that the distinguished Senator from Ohio will review the subject before he presses for the removal of any tolls.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No, I am not pressing for the removal of tolls; I am arguing that tolls ought to be imposed everywhere. Let us be clear about that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood from the latter part of the Senator's remarks, but not from the early part, that he was complaining because there were similar streams in the United States, wholly navigable or canalized streams, on which no toll was charged.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. I contend that it is wrong to spend $1 billion in the building of a navigable stream and not charge tolls, and to spend $130 million on the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway and charge tolls.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the existence of an international agreement makes a great difference. In the case of

the Panama Canal, there is an international agreement, without which the canal could not have been built. Not only our own ships but the ships of all nations are allowed passage, and allowed passage on similar terms.

Also there is an international accord concerning the St. Lawrence Seaway, which is not required in other cases.

So far as I am concerned, I believe excellent work was done by all those who negotiated this project.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is speaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am speaking of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I agree.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was constructed in the cheapest way possible and brings the most advantages that are possible to be had. It is a wonderful thing for the whole country to have the great Midwest, in effect, placed upon the Atlantic. I hope there will not be a lack of accord as to the very splendid nature of this fine project.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I pointed out a while ago, there is no question in my mind that the seaway will require the expenditure of millions of dollars more than I indicated, for the deepening of the major harbors on the Great Lakes. This will be necessary to accommodate drafts of at least 25 feet.

If the Senator will examine the record concerning the applications that have been made by the various ports along the Great Lakes, he will note that millions of dollars will be spent there, with no tolls to be charged. That will be done in order to carry out a policy that has been ours for a long time.

I am hopeful that in the future it may be possible to have Canada pay off its bonds without tolls. I am sure in that event the United States would reciprocate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. With that statement I cannot agree, and I will point out why I cannot.

If tolls were not charged on the seaway, the taxpayers would have had to pay this year $4,750,000 for interest alone. But $3,300,000 in tolls was collected. So the general taxpayers, for this 1 year, on interest alone, were saved $3,300,000. I anticipate that the tolls will increase; and as they do, the taxpayers will have to pay nothing. The cost will be paid by the people who use the seaway, and that is how it should be.

I was one of the proponents of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I was then Governor of Ohio. I said that tolls should be charged. I have not changed my view on that subject.

But if tolls are helping to spare the taxpayer his obligation on the St .Lawrence Seaway, tolls can spare the taxpayer on the Arkansas River, on the Ohio River, on the Mississippi, and everywhere else. That is my point. This very case demonstrates that tolls can be charged and can pay off the interest, and probably later pay off the principal.

I wish an answer would be given to the situation concerning the $3,600,000 that is now available, through tolls, to pay interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am certain the Senator from Ohio must realize that the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway has been of great benefit to all the States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course it has. It has brought about a great increase in business. Except for the fact that Canhad this waterway built was to make it as we did, a canal would not have been constructed. As the Senator from Florida has said, the only way to have had this waterway built was to make it self-sustaining.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Canada was smart in doing so. If Congress began doing things in that way, by insisting that such projects be self-liquidating, the taxpayers of the country and the fiscal position of the United States would be better off.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then fewer and fewer projects would be constructed, and our country would lag behind, because the entire country benefits through such a system of transportation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana further yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to have the Senator from Ohio hear this statement, also.

At the time when Congress acted, the Dominion of Canada served notice that if the United States did not act on this much cheaper program, whereby a part of the canal would be in our country and the major part in Canada, Canada proposed to build one by its own means, which would have been much more expensive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator recalls that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recall that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The canal would have been constructed through Canada and would have called for much higher tolls. From every point of view I can think of, the arrangement made was the most economical one possible and the most helpful possible to that great area of the country which the Senator from Ohio represents, in part, with such great distinction.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman about an item under the "Mississippi River and tributaries," $50,000 for the Cache River project, listed under the heading of "Construction." The item was in the budget estimates.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The House did not allow it. The House omitted it. I did not realize it had been restored in the bill until the report was printed.

I ask my distinguished friend if the $50,000 item in the present bill is intended to start construction on the drainage project which is known as the Cache River project.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. I refer the Senator to page 3273 of the hearings. Mr. McRae appeared. He said:

> Mr. Chairman, as you recall, the 1963 Appropriation Act directed the corps to make a study to determine whether additional protection for lands in this area should be provided. The report of the division engineer has been completed and is now under review in the Chief's office. Until that report is completed, Mr. Chairman, we are not in a position to initiate construction of this project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished chairman. That was my recollection of the matter.

Mr ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. For that reason, it would be inadvisable to initiate an appropriation for construction of the project.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the House had reasons for deleting the item. As my good friend from Arkansas knows, our subcommittee has seldom rejected budgeted items.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate that. I do not know that I am opposed to the project as such.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the Senator's position.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is a belief among the people in the lower area of the river—what is called the White River backwater area—that construction of the project would only increase the backwater height and thus cover lands not now subjected to being inundated. For that reason, there is strong opposition in that section. In the upper reaches of the river, the landowners are quite eager to have the project approved, to have appropriations made, and to have the project constructed.

I believe I am correct in saying that the appropriation in the bill now under consideration is intended to cover the Federal Government's contribution on bridges involved in interstate highway construction in that area.

Mr ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the bridges are not constructed to make allowance for the improvement, the cost in the future would be much higher.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. It is not intended to construct the project the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The money is intended to help in the construction of highway facilities.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would be a part of the Federal Government's contribution.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct. As I said, the House struck out the amount. I do not know the reason for that. I do not attempt to look behind the House action for a reason.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not checked with members of the House committee, but I believe the reason was that they were waiting for a full report. There is an unsettled and uncertain situation as to what the improvement would do in respect to landowners in the lower end of the valley.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure my good friend from Arkansas that if the amount is left in the bill—as it will be in all probability—this item will be taken up in conference with the House conferees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish at this time to move to strike it. Ultimately, I may support the over-all project and appropriation for it. I understand that the money is for the Federal Government's contribution to highway construction, rather than to start an over-all drainage project. I am not certain I would oppose the project.

Since the bill must go to conference, I shall make further inquiry about this matter and be more certain later as to whether I feel the item should be left in or whether the Senate should yield in conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the interest and cooperation of my good friend the chairman on these matters. I know how he feels about such projects. He is enthusiastic, as I am, when good projects are presented which show a proper ratio of benefits to cost. I appreciate that. I especially appreciate his interest in projects in my State.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Congress has shown its interest. This is not merely my interest.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I know. The Congress has.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are times, with respect to such improvements, when one group of landowners is greatly benefited and another group of landowners suffers property damage. Until that question can be resolved, I would not wish to have the project started.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator knows that what he is discussing now is not peculiar to the Cache River project.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is true with respect to many projects.

Mr. ELLENDER. A similar situation faced the committee with respect to a project in the State of Kansas. There had been a lot of opposition. Today I believe everybody is happy, because the dam in question has proved to be better than was anticipated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am sure the people of Arkansas will be happy about this project if the Corps of Engineers can find a solution to the backwater problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope they can do so. I hope that a satisfactory solution will be set forth in the report which is now in the process of being reviewed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I assure the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, I would not attempt to provide construction money which would do damage to a great many people.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I had no doubt about that. I merely wished to make the record clear. Although the report does not discuss the project, the record will be clear as to what the money is for.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, for yielding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; and that the bill as thus amended be regarded, for purposes of amendment, as original text; and that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 3, line 18, after the word "construction", to strike out "$18,000,000" and insert "$20,625,000".

On page 4, line 11, after the word "constructure", to strike out "$793,282,700" and insert "$849,856,000".

On page 5, line 16, after the word "activities", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$157,368,000".

On page 6, at the beginning of line 6, to strike out "$74,500,000" and insert "$80,406,000".

On page 6, after line 7, to insert:

"UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

"For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: *Provided,* That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity."

On page 8, line 5, after the word "transfusions," to strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$25,725,000."

On page 8, line 15, after the word "assets", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,250,000".

On page 9, line 15, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000,000" and insert "$9,285,000"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "sixteen" and insert "twenty-one"; in the same line, after the word "vehicles", to insert "of which sixteen are", and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,300" and insert "$7,800".

On page 10, line 23, after the word "expended", to strike out "$9,894,000" and insert "$10,442,000"; in line 24, after the word "which", to strike out "$8,621,000" and insert "$8,902,000", and on page 11, line 4, after the word "That", to strike out "$340,000" and insert "$388,000".

On page 11, line 17, after the word "expended", to strike out "$180,190,000" and insert "$187,425,000".

On page 13, line 5, after the word "program", to strike out "$12,217,000" and insert "$12,367,000".

On page 13, line 16, after the word "expended", to strike out "$97,845,700" and insert "$97,989,200", and in line 19, after the word "and", to strike out "$3,809,000" and insert "$3,952,500".

On page 16, line 23, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following proviso:

"*Provided,* That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath Project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2(c) of the Act of June 17, 1944, and Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956."

On page 19, at the begininng of line 5, to strike out "$36,000,000" and insert "$36,204,000".

On page 19, line 10, after the word "energy", to strike out "$13,200,000" and insert "$13,500,000".

On page 22, line 25, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$2,308,169,000'" and insert "2,369,524,000".

On page 24, at the begininng of line 9, to strike out "$380,000,000" and insert $"418,695,000".

On page 27, at the beginning of line 22, to strike out "$46,000,000" and insert "$48,284,000".

On page 28, after line 10, to insert a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IV

"Funds appropriated to the President

"Public Works Acceleration

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress."

On page 28, line 23, to change the title number from "IV" to "V".

On page 28, line 25, to change the section number from "401" to "501".

On page 29, line 6, to change the section number from "402" to "502".

On page 30, line 14, to change the section number from "403" to "503".

On page 30, line 21, to change the section number from "404" to "504".

On page 31, linc 3, to change the section number from "405" to "505".

On page 31, line 14, to change the section number from "406" to "506".

On page 32, line 6, to change the section number from "407" to "507".

On page 32, line 19, to change the section number from "408" to "508".

On page 32, line 24, to change the section number from "409" to "509".

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate has been favored with a very lucid and detailed characterization of the civil functions bill for the fiscal year 1964. That statement was made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I offer my congratulations to my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, for the competent and conscientious way in which he has handled the time-consuming and—at times—somewhat thankless task in the appropriation of funds contained in the Public Works Appropriation bill.

Senator ELLENDER has been in charge of this bill for approximately 10 years. He has earned a deserved reputation as an expert in the field of water resource conservation and related subjects. He is familiar with the problem faced by each State in the Union. Every project request is given a thorough examination by him and his subcommittee before consideration can be given to appropriation of funds. This is evident in the fact that we started hearings on the Corps of Engineers budget on Tuesday, May 7, and concluded on November 20. The vastness of the job is demonstrated by the fact that 3,328 pages of printed testimony are before Members of the Senate for reference to Corps of Engineers requests.

The subcommittee heard over 900 witnesses. All told, the hearings on the overall public works bill comprise more than 4,500 pages of testimony, and more than 1,000 witnesses were heard.

I assure the Senator from Louisiana that, after having participated in many of the numerous sessions of the subcommittee, I not only sympathize with the suggestion he made for curtailing the repetitive parts of the hearings, but also assure him of my cooperation in every possible way.

While the amounts in this bill are large, it must be remembered that America's problems in this area are here and now. They cannot be shunted off to some future years. Members of the Committee on Appropriations are very much aware that they cannot and should not provide all the funds requested for all the projects urged by many thousands of individuals and organizations in the country. Senator ELLENDER has always taken pride in the fact that no projects are approved by our subcommittee unless adequate hearings have been held on them. The subcommittee shares in this pride.

As ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, it is a continuing pleasure for me to work with Senator ELLENDER. I also welcome this opportunity to congratulate him, publicly, as I have already done privately.

Other distinguished Senators have played a major part in this important bill—although perhaps in lesser degree, because the number of items dealt with in other parts of the bill are lesser in number. For example, our respected President pro tempore and Appropriations Committee chairman, Senator HAYDEN, has performed his usual valuable service in handling another difficult phase of the bill, the funding of requirements of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation. This is also a major water resources program. We are fortunate to have Senator HAYDEN as chairman of this subcommittee. As an Arizonian and as a Member of the Congress since 1912, he knows more about the great water problems faced by much of the Nation than virtually any other Member of the Congress. He is also responsible for the financial requirements of the several power marketing agencies of the Department of the Interior.

My close friend and distinguished colleague on this side of the aisle, Senator MUNDT, of South Dakota, is the able ranking Republican member of the same subcommittee. He has done an excellent job in the examination and sifting of testimony for the great many requests for funds.

Senator HILL is another devoted member of the Committee on Appropriations and it is my privilege to serve as ranking minority member on his subcommittee on the important section of the bill dealing with the Atomic Energy Commission and the Tennessee Valley Authority. He, too, deserves our gratitude and congratulations.

Mr. President, let me also state that, in common with other Senate committees, we are particularly favored by our excellent staff. Ken Bousquet, the clerk of the subcommittee, has done an excellent job. It is a delight to work with him, not only in the committee room in the hearings, but also in executive sessions and in the field. It has been my privilege to do all those things. On the minority side, Ed King has rendered similar fine service.

Mr. President, most cities and towns in America at one time or another have had problems which came within the purview of this national program: Floods, ravaging property and human life, hurricanes, beach erosion, navigation, multiple-purpose river basin problems, locks and dams and canals are just a few of the great many problems involved.

In my own State of Nebraska, like all other States and especially those in the West, water is literally a life or death matter. We Nebraskans, working with the Federal Government, have spent large sums over the years in a massive effort to conserve our natural resources and to prevent the ravages of natural disasters. And we will spend a great many more millions in the years ahead.

In the area of the rivers and harbors, flood control and navigation program, an estimated $85,000 will be spent this fiscal year on general investigations of projects pertaining to Nebraska. There is the Big Blue River, Nebraska and Kansas, for which $30,000 has been programed; the Elkhorn River, $10,000; the Nemaha-Little Nemaha River, Nebraska and Kansas, $15,000; and the Platte River, $30,000.

Advance engineering and design for projects in my State will amount to $120,000, with $80,000 scheduled for the Little Papillion Creek and $45,000 for Norfolk River.

Two large construction projects are underway and funds have been earmarked to the extent of $650,000 for the Gering Valley project, and $4,200,000 for the Salt Creek and tributaries.

The Corps of Engineers has estimated an expenditure of $685,000 for operation and maintenance requirements of existent Nebraska public works projects.

In addition, Mr. President, there is a program identified as small authorized projects. A serious flood control problem exists in the vicinity of Clarkson, Neb., which comes within the provisions of section 205 of the 1948 Flood Control Act. This project has been fully investigated and found to be eligible under the provisions of the act. It is expected that the Corps of Engineers will find it possible to allot construction funds from the appropriation allowed for small authorized projects for which the Senate committee provided a modest increase.

Completion of this work will enable Clarkson to proceed with public works of its own financing, including a sewage disposal plant.

The people of Nebraska are also especially interested in the Missouri River channel stabilization program which covers the States of Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, as well as Nebraska. The Senate has approved an amount of $6 million for the project ranging from Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Neb., and $2,700,000 for the part of the program extending from Omaha to Kansas City, with a like amount from Kansas City to the mouth of the Missouri River—including a 9-foot channel.

The latter item is of particular interest to Missouri River navigation from Kansas City to Omaha. It will eliminate the "bottleneck" of a less-than-9-foot channel between Kansas City and St. Louis which has imposed upon river traffic upstream from Kansas City, the lesser channel depth. This action will make possible fully loaded barges heretofore barred, thus bringing about a lesser per-unit freight cost.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION—CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Under the direction of the Bureau of Reclamation, the vast natural resources of the 17 Western States and Alaska are being conserved and developed for the welfare of the Nation. This is accomplished through the planning, construction, and operation of facilities to irrigate lands, furnish domestic and industrial water supplies, and develop related hydroelectric power and flood control.

An estimated $18,927,000 will be used in fiscal 1964 on reclamation construction and rehabilitation projects in and around Nebraska. For example, $8,100,000 has been programed for the Ainsworth unit of the Missouri River Basin project; another basin program, the Farwell unit, has been allocated $5 million. There is also the Frenchman-Cambridge division, $1,787,000.

The Senate and the House Appropriations Committees allowed $23 million for the Transmission division of the Missouri River Basin, a $956,000 reduction from the budget estimate. Of this reduction, $641,000 is to be absorbed by the several States involved in this program. Both committees agreed that this cut could readily be absorbed since funds for new construction will be available for only about 6 months.

The Bureau of Reclamation had earmarked $2,578,000 as the amount for Nebraska.

An estimated $805,000 will be expended for drainage and minor construction on the Bostwick division of the Missouri River Basin project in Nebraska and Kansas. Another item for which $657,000 has been approved is the rehabilitation and betterment program for the North Platte project in Nebraska and Wyoming.

RECLAMATION—PROJECTS INVESTIGATIONS

The Bureau of Reclamation's project investigations include the following items:

Elkhorn division, $64,000; Little Blue unit, $10,000; Mirage Flats extension Unit $56,000; North Loup division, $8,000; O'Neill unit, $10,000; Wilber unit, $158,000.

Basin surveys which affect Nebraska include the comprehensive framework plan covering Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota and Wyoming, $522,000.

Advance planning funds for basin projects include Cedar Rapids division, $195,000, and the North Republican

unit, Colorado and Nebraska, $84,000, for a total of $1,174,000.

Mr. President, my colleague, Senator CURTIS, and I are appreciative for the favorable consideration the members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations gave to our request for an item of $100,000 for continuation of the preauthorization investigations on the Nebraska midstate unit. Taxpayers in the midstate district have spent a great many thousands of dollars of their own money to pursue this project; in fact, more than $300,000.

Mr. President, the Senate can consider the first three titles of this bill with the confident knowledge that they have been carefully considered by both the subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee.

The projects represented in this measure may lack the glamour of the space program or weapons tests or exotic medical research, but they are of vital importance in terms of saving lives and providing for a brighter future for generations to come.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS

Title IV of the bill, Mr. President, is quite a different matter.

Accelerated public works, for which title IV appropriates, like so many crash programs, was launched with a great fanfare and with extravagant claims of potential reductions in the unemployment market. The facts have never borne out the claims.

The program has been roundly criticized as one of the most poorly administered in Washington, in many cases putting even our foreign aid bungles to shame.

In addition, one of the most respected Members of the Senate, and a member of the Appropriations Committee, has publicly charged that the program has been administered with willful discrimination and with glaring discrepancies.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at this point in my remarks there be printed excerpts from the hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee which contain the exchange between the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Administrator of the Area Redevelopment Administration, Mr. Batt.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI PROJECT

Senator STENNIS. Mr. Chairman, this is a matter now that I have had to deal with for months and months regarding projects in my State out of the money that has already been appropriated through the previous two appropriations. My office dealt with them on these matters for a long time, and they were told that there was a long construction season envisioned in the South and a short construction season envisioned in the North, and that they would get to Mississippi later.

Later, the tone changed. They said that all of these projects in Mississippi were under review—under review.

And, in the meantime, I have had people in Mississippi call me, they were calling me, and they were calling Senator EASTLAND and the other members of the Mississippi delegation. I advised them to go to Atlanta, the area office, and to talk about this project and they did, and finally the projects came on into Washington.

I then got into the picture myself by calling about these projects and was told that they were under review, and so forth.

PROJECTS IN OTHER STATES

Now, I gather from press releases from Mr. Batt's office that the figures would run like this—and I am talking about the second appropriation. In the first appropriation, I think that Mississippi fared all right. But we pieced together from the agencies press releases facts like this:

Alabama received 67 projects—and I am sure they are worthwhile, for a round sum of $13 million.

Arkansas, a number of projects. I don't have the exact number, for $8,500,000.

Georgia, 65 projects, for $8,067,000.

Louisiana, 45 projects, with a total of $14 million.

Now, I mention these because they are in areas in the country similarly situated and with similar unemployment.

TWO PROJECTS APPROVED FOR MISSISSIPPI

Now, of all those sums and this great number of projects, only two projects were approved for Mississippi, two small ones, totaling $242,000, instead of $10 or $12 million, as for the other States, we had received only $242,000.

Now, I took this up with Mr. Batt and later I took it up again with Mr. ROOSEVELT and the chairman of the full committee. I also talked on the telephone with Secretary Hodges about it. And I charged that there is a willful, deliberate, and purposeful discrimination against Mississippi, for some reason. I don't know what.

Now, I voted against this original program. I was not convinced that it was needed. But when this appropriation came up the last time for the second $450 million, I took issue with the members of the committee arguing against it and said that I thought it had been fairly and properly administered, which I did. I will have to withdraw those remarks now. I cannot say that.

COMMITTEE INVESTIGATORS

Now, I talked to Mr. Batt and I have talked to others and, when this thing came to a head, the committee investigators went into it. I think that Mississippi under any fair rule would have been entitled to $10 or $11 million in projects of like kind. Now, that is not just a guess, it is by comparison with other States similarly situated.

Now, what is a man going to do when his State is treated that way? What is the man going to think? What is the committee going to do?

Now, I have asked for the name of the person that is guilty of this discrimination. Mr. Batt said that he is responsible for it. That is not the question. I have asked Mr. Roosevelt and he talked about something else—no answer to my question.

I asked Mr. Hodges to look into this matter personally. They say now that there are no more funds.

There are 80 projects, I understand, gentlemen, on this list from Mississippi, that have been approved at the Atlanta regional level and they have come up to Washington. Some of them have been lying on the desks for a long while, while I was being told they were "under review, under review."

Now, I don't want to embarrass anyone unnecessarily, but I feel compelled to bring this out. I am only asking for just treatment for my State.

So, I am ready to prove by witnesses from this staff all of these allegations that I have made here, plus more—but I do want the committee to go into it, and I raise that point now after months and months of being patient and being put off.

RELEASE OF ADDITIONAL PROJECTS

Now, after this came up, they did release 12 projects in the total amount of $1,472,000 in Federal money—but that was after this disclosure and later confrontation and after this charge was proven and after the committee investigators went into it.

Now, later—those releases were about 3 weeks ago—later they released some small forestry projects, totaling in all, I believe, about $325,000. Stretching that figure a little, you can say about $2 million worth has been released.

ADMINISTRATION OF FUNDS

Now, they say the money is all gone in the community facilities program. And a lot of these projects in Mississippi were in community facilities. I understand there is no money in this $45 million for the community facilities. I don't know how to meet that situation, but the point I raise is the administration of these funds.

How can the Congress go along with this if these facts are true? And they are true. They are proven, every one of them. I think they are admitted. As I say, I don't want to be unjust or unfair to anyone, but the whole representation to my staff and to me has been misleading and evasive, and these matters were not under review, except there has been a black mark put on them, and somebody in this Department did it. I don't know who did the dirty work. I am not laying any charge against Mr. Batt, not at all, I don't know. I doubt if he is the one, and I don't have any reason to believe he is the one, except he wants to assume responsibility.

I want to thank the chairman of this committee, too, for his consideration to me in this and say to the chairman of this subcommittee, Senator ELLENDER, I just thought that the chairman of the full committee handled this project when it was up last time, in a supplemental, but I did mention it to you, as soon as I learned it was within your jurisdiction.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, I remember, Senator, your mentioning this problem to me.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Senator ELLENDER. I contacted someone in the Department, and requested certain information.

Mr. Batt, do you have anything to say for the record regarding the charges made by Senator STENNIS?

STATEMENT REGARDING CHARGES

Mr. BATT. Well, sir, I think it is the only case I know of, the only State I know of, where the allegation has been made that they have gotten less than their fair share.

I was as distressed as the Senator when it was brought to our attention, and we immediately looked into it. We found, as the Senator pointed out in all fairness, that the State has fared rather well on the first appropriation and that they had not done as well on the second appropriation and had not gotten as much as their neighboring States or, indeed, as much as they had every reason to expect.

Senator ELLENDER. Well, who is responsible for that?

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTION

Mr. BATT. I will assume full responsibility for it, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. That doesn't do any good. You must have had somebody under you who didn't keep his eye on this.

Mr. BATT. No, I'll assume all responsibility. As the President said, you know, in another connection, failure is an orphan; success has a thousand fathers.

When the Senator first brought this to our attention, the program was not complete and the situation has changed from week to week. We have succeeded in ameliorating some of that underage.

HEW PROJECTS

As the Senator pointed out in all fairness, we have succeeded in getting 12 HEW projects—these are the hospital projects and the sewage disposal plants which are all that the State of Mississippi has submitted that are not interlinked with CFA projects, we have gotten all that the State submitted ap-

proved. We were fortunate in having funds still unallocated in HEW.

FOREST SERVICE PROJECTS

On the Forest Service side, we have done better. As the Senator has pointed out in all fairness, we have gotten in 11 projects with $325,000. The Forest Service tells me incidentaliy, Senator, that if this additionai funding would be approved, we can again do better, although, in the one national forest that I understand you have there—we ought to be able to put in about $700,000 worth.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES ADMINISTRATION

The CFA has been out of funds. That has been our big problem. We never, of course, could fund the 80 projects. No State got all the projects they asked for. We have a backlog of $700 million——

Senator STENNIS. By CFA, you refer to the Community Facilities Administration?

Mr. BATT. CFA is Community Facilities Administration—Housing and Home Finance.

Senator STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. BATT. So, we never could in a million years fund all the projects that are in. We have a backlog of $700 million of State and iocal projects.

We can, we feei, fund some of those from Mississippi, the most pressing ones, if and when some of the projects under CFA that have already been approved are not accepted, don't come through. There will be some faliout there. There is some slippage, and we hope to be able to improve the CFA picture in Mississippi, and that, I think, is the one that looks the worst. It looks good in Forest Service, it looks good in the HEW, and it looks very bad in CFA.

Senator STENNIS. May I ask you a question? You are talking about it looking good. Now, how did it look before this thing was exposed?

Mr. BATT. I think it was, I am still——

Senator STENNIS. What is your evaiuation of that?

Mr. BATT. I think, sir, in the first appropriation, as you pointed out, it looked fair. In the second appropriation, Mississippi was very severeiy under what they should have received, no doubt about it.

Senator STENNIS. May I ask some questions, Mr. Chairman?

Senator ELLENDER. Surely, proceed.

CHARGE OF WILLFUL DISCRIMINATION

Senator STENNIS. I charge that this is a wiilfui discrimination. What is your response to that, that this was deliberately done and wiilfuily done and it couldn't have been any other way. What is your answer?

Mr. BATT. Weli, sir, I would personaiiy accept the responsibility for the——

Senator ELLENDER. But that is not the question.

Mr. BATT (continuing). Unwisdom or poor wisdom. I don't believe it was willful discrimination, and I think that our efforts at the direction of Secretary Hodges and Under Secretary Rooseveit, to improve the situation and bring Mississippi up much closer to their—to what they have every reason to expect—is an indication that we have no—that as soon as it was brought to our attention, we have done aii that we can to repair it.

Senator STENNIS. But may I go back to that question?

Mr. BATT. I would be the first to say, though, Senator, however, that we have made a lot more mistakes than this.

FUNDS FROM RECORD APPROPRIATION

Senator STENNIS. Well, go back to my question. Before it was disciosed here by me, before I contacted and confronted you with these figures, there were oniy $242,000 given Mississippi.

Mr. BATT. Out of the second appropriation.

Senator STENNIS. Out of the second appropriation. Do you say that that was a willful discrimination or not?

Mr. BATT. Weii, sir, I would not—I would say that the evidence is that we then pitched in and did our best to make up that underage that was evidence of our—it was our indication of desire on the administrative part to——

Senator STENNIS. That is certainiy not the question. I am sure that the Chair and the committee understand it.

Looking at that picture as it was, when I confronted you with those pictures, $242,000 had been aiiotted for Mississippi and these other figures for the other States, do you say that that was a wiiful discrimination or not?

ADMISSION OF MISTAKE

Mr. BATT. Sir, I would call it a mistake. Obviously, this is a matter of semantics——

Senator STENNIS. A willful mistake?

Mr. BATT. I would say it was a mistake.

Senator STENNIS. Just a plain mistake?

Mr. BATT. I would say it was a mistake and I say we have made many other mistakes and we have tried to repair them when they were brought to our attention——

* * * * *

GLARING DISCREPANCIES IN ADMINISTRATION

Senator STENNIS. Do you expect this committee to give you more money in view of such giaring discrepancies here in the administration of this fund? Do you expect us to accept your statement here that it was just a mistake?

Mr. BATT. Weii, what the committee does, sir, is of course, entirely up to the committee, but I do feel that this is an opportunity to make up for some of this shortfaii in Mississippi and other States through the Forest Service. We aiso hope that we can put some 15,000 or 20,000 people to work as the result of this proposal.

Senator STENNIS. May I ask you to get back to the subject. Were you directed by anyone above you to withhoid these projects from Mississippi?

Mr. BATT. No, sir.

CRITICISM WITHIN DEPARTMENT

Senator STENNIS. Have you reprimanded or criticized anyone under you for doing this act?

Mr. BATT. I think it is true to say that when you brought this to the attention of the Secretary and myself and Mr. Roosevelt that we thoroughly criticized everybody that had anything to do with it, including ourselves.

Senator STENNIS. Well, have you done anything about it? Have you investigated to find out how it happened?

Mr. BATT. I think we know the facts, and I think they are as I represented them to you, Senator.

* * * * *

QUESTION RE ARA-APPROVED PROJECTS

Senator STENNIS. Just one more question, it might shed some light on these Mississippi projects being deciined out of the second appropriation. Isn't it true that a number of these projects were approved by ARA, but never were approved and therefore feii by the wayside by what you call the CFA, the Community Faciiities Administration—there was no money came out of that part of it. Weren't they the ones that were holding up?

Mr. BATT. I would have to check that back on a project-by-project basis, I do not know, Senator.

Senator ELLENDER. Weii, I think that we shed light on who is really responsible.

Mr. BATT. I take complete responsibility for it, sir—if I aiso get credit for the success of the program.

Senator STENNIS. Weii, I understand that. I think that that answer is just a little too clever, if I may say so. We have been over that many times. What I am trying to get at is the facts.

Now I want to know who did this dirty work, and I don't think that you originated it, frankly.

Mr. BATT. Weii, sir; I think that——

Senator STENNIS. But I do want to know if the CFA had approved any of these, whether it was left on their desk or not. I think the committee is interested in who did this.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this testimony makes out a convincing case of unfair and discriminatory treatment. Factors unrelated to the guidelines and standards adopted for allocation of such funds were allowed to govern. If the regular processes and channels of congressional action had been followed, no such inexcusable results would have occurred.

In view of the showing of willful discrimination in Mississippi, it stands to reason that there is high probability of similar abuse by the executive department in other areas, though proof thereof might be difficult. At any rate, the testimony quoted above shows clearly how foolhardy it is for Congress to abdicate its power over the purse strings in favor of difficult-to-control administration of another branch of government. We should not extend such abdication. The $45 million provided in title IV of this bill should be deleted on this ground alone; and in due time it will by my intention to submit an amendment which will have for its purpose the achievement of such a deletion.

Mr. President, the Congress had authorized $900 million for accelerated public works. All but $50 million of that amount has been appropriated, and, as I understand, has already been spent or earmarked. What we are being asked to approve now, in the closing days of this session, is that last final bite.

This demand is completely unrealistic and premature, because the policy of the Congress toward this program is far from clear. The Public Works Committee has before it two bills to increase the authorization to $2.4 billion and $3.9 billion for this accelerated public works program—but not a single hearing has yet been held.

Earlier this afternoon, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] made an announcement that hearings would commence in a day or so on these bills. At long last. After all the weeks and months that have passed during the pendency of these bills, we have not yet arrived at the point of establishing the current sense and the current thinking of the Congress, in either body, in regard to continuation of the accelerated public works program.

I would hope and expect that in the course of those hearings, information will be developed on which the Congress can make a considered judgment. We have already seen the maladministration which inevitably accompanies a crash program such as this one. Let us not fall victim to more of the same disease. Let us concur in the action of the House of Representatives which denied the entire $45 million.

Mr. President, the failures and mistakes of the accelerated public works program are well known. In many cases the projects cannot properly be called public works; they are more in the nature of the WPA-type leaf raking, makework.

Specific examples that have appeared in the RECORD are cemetery maintenance, archeological research, exotic plant control, and pasture improvement.

But there are many other examples of mismanagement. One of our colleagues could recite the case of a town in a certain Southern State which inquired of the Administrator as to whatever had happened to its application. The reply was that the county in which the community was located had received its quota and hence the request was denied. Further inquiry showed that the Area Redevelopment Administration had sent some funds to another county of the same name, but in a totally different State.

There is the example of the town to which the Administrator sent glad tidings that its project had been approved. It developed that a year earlier it had withdrawn its request because the community had voted against the necessary local bond issue by a vote of some 9 to 1.

Congressman KYL, of Iowa, on April 9 of this year regaled his colleagues in the House with a hilarious comedy of errors involving projects in his State where, again, the aid went to the wrong county for the wrong project by the wrong agency.

I could go on, Mr. President. Perhaps it is enough to recall the loan to reopen a closed coal mine in Utah where another mine had just laid off 125 miners because of the drop in the coal market. Or the vast number of motels which have been built in areas already overburdened with hundreds of unused motel rooms. Or the sewage work done in the poor little suburb of Detroit known as Grosse Point. Anyone who has ever visited that part of the Detroit area knows that it is not a rundown area.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress several days ago promised us that "the expenditures of your Government will be administered with the utmost thrift and frugality. I ask your help. I will insist that the Government get a dollar value for a dollar spent."

Mr. President, the record of the accelerated public works program clearly demonstrates that its falls far short of yielding a dollar value for a dollar spent.

These funds of $45 million were originally requested for direct Federal activities, namely, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior, with $2.7 million skimmed off the top for "administration"; that is, to pay for salaries and paper shuffling.

These were not to be community projects in which the local areas shared. They were to be work in the national forests and parks over the winter. They were designated as short leadtime projects whose effect on unemployment would be immediate.

But the Appropriations Committee, in its wisdom, recommends that half of the amount be allocated to projects of the Community Facilities Administration which, with a much longer leadtime, will not be able to reduce unemployment in the immediate weeks and months ahead.

Thus, the argument for this special $45 million has been cut precisely in half.

Mr. President, page 7141 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 1, 1963, contains some rather lengthy remarks by me on the efficacy of this whole accelerated public works program. In that statement, I made the point that the whole effort amounted to only about a drop in a 5-million-man bucket of unemployment—a drop of about 2 percent of that figure. Unless one counts the additional Federal employees who are at work administering—or maladministering—this program, the effect on unemployment is insignificant. To solve the unemployment problem by this means and at this rate would require 30 billion of tax dollars.

But that is still not the major objection to this bill, Mr. President. Nor is the principal defect in this proposal its poor timing, before the Public Works Committee has held hearings on new authorizations.

The really fatal flaw is the fact that it is a poorly conceived, hastily devised scheme to crash our way to a solution of the unemployment problem.

Sometimes crash programs are justified, as in war or other times of national peril. But we have seen the folly of the waste and extravagance that inevitably accompany such all-out assaults on any national program. I would call to the Senate's attention the series of recent reports by the General Accounting Office of the millions upon millions of dollars that have been lost in the space program because of its crash character.

What is required is an orderly system for the allocation and expenditure of these funds, through the regular congressional process, by appropriation to existing and established agencies of the Government. There is neither need nor justification for a superagency like the Area Redevelopment Administration, sitting atop the old-line agencies like Agriculture and Interior in the running of this program. There is no need for the appropriation of these funds to the President for reallocation to the ARA and then for re-reallocation to Agriculture. It is a perversion of the traditional and accepted system of our governmental routine.

Mr. President, the evidence is overwhelming against the accelerated public works program. It is entirely outside the limits of congressional control.

The merit of handling an additional $45 million to the accelerated public works program has not been demonstrated. In fact, the hearings before our subcommittee would suggest the opposite.

But if there is a case to be made for this program, then the place for it to be made is before the Public Works Committee which can then recommend a course of action to the Senate.

Until then, Mr. President, I strongly urge that we withhold the $45 million.

Mr. President, I repeat my remarks as to the quality of the hearings that were held, the patience of the chairman, and the very fine work that was done by all of the staff and members of the committee. This bill is worthy of serious consideration by the Senate, and, with the exception of title IV, I commend it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1533. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, granting a franchise to D.C. Transit System, Inc.; and

S. 2054. An act to eliminate the maintenance by the District of Columbia of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys held in trust by the government of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7885) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Mr. MILLER obtained the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma providing that in doing so, I shall not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Iowa for giving me this opportunity, so that I may thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the spectacularly fine work he has done in considering all the great public works projects that have been laid before his committee. He has done so with fairness, with care, with discrimination, and I believe with a careful view as to their utilization and their effect on our entire national program. I do not believe there is a portion of the United States that has not benefited from the work which has occupied so much of the chairman's time. The work has been handled with great care.

I wonder if I may ask the Senator from Louisiana a question, in order to clarify some of the language on page 41 of the Senate committee report on the bill. I refer to a part of title II of the bill, dealing with Interior Department agencies—specifically, the Southwest Power Administration.

The Southwest Power Administration is a 20-year-old institution which was established to help deliver the power generated at multipurpose flood control dams to various REA's within the State of Oklahoma. The Administration has been cognizant of the fact that its job of delivering power should be beneficial not only to the cooperatives but also,

where possible, it should assist in distribution of power and the sale of peak power to private utilities, thereby eliminating the need for costly extra generating plants that would have to be built by private companies to serve a 2- or 3-hour peak load. Trading peak power for regular power has been helpful in the entire region. Many friends from whom I have heard since the report was made are fearful that the language appearing in the second paragraph relating to the continuing fund for the Southwest Power Administration might result in severely hampering it in its duty to supply the public power generated at dams to the preference users.

Thcy have no fault to find with the first phrase which reads:

The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

They are anxious, and hope that this language would not prevent them from delivering the power, when subsequent dams in this region have been completed and the power is ready to be delivered to the preference users—namely, distributing co-ops of the REA.

I interpret the language as being merely a restatement of the Flood Control and Power Marketing Acts.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if that is not generally the meaning of the Flood Control Act?

Mr. ELLENDER. In my opinion it is a restatement of the law. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma recalls that in the budget for fiscal 1947, there was a request made by SPA for $23 million to begin construction of a system of generation and transmission facilities. After this request was denied, REA began making loans to co-ops for generating facilities to produce power which would be purchased by SPA and for transmission facilities which would be leased to, and operated by, SPA. The committee interpreted this arrangement as meaning that the Department of Agriculture was being asked to put up the money to establish co-op generating and transmission facilities for use by SPA and which depended for their feasibility on these arrangements with SPA. The committee then thought it was wrong to have one department put up the money to construct generating and transmission facilities and then have another Government department use them in order to make the loans feasible.

The committee took positive action on that and Congress amended the law on the committee's recommendation. The Senator read only a portion of the statement in the current report to which he referred.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. The statement attempts to reiterate what is the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the lines were necessary, there would be no objection, in the language of the committee report, to the construction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course not.

Mr. MONRONEY. When the dams are ready to produce power, the cooperative arrangement with any group building the lines would be permissible, under the Flood Control Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to read a short statement which was prepared, to indicate the reasons why this was done, and when it was done.

The committee report contains the admonition on page 41 that no part of the Southwestern Power Administration's continuing fund is to be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration. This, of course, amounts to a restatement of the law.

The Southwestern Power Administration was created to market surplus power and energy generated at reservoir projects under the control of the Department of the Army. The projects were constructed for flood control and for other purposes. The electrical energy was only a byproduct, and there was no intention of putting the Government into the power business, except to the extent necessary to market the surplus power from these reservoirs. When the Southwestern Power Administration sought funds for a steamplant to firm up the surplus hydroelectric power, those funds were denied—those are the funds to which I have referred—in order to prevent the gradual buildup of a tax-supported public power industry against which private power could not compete.

In 1949, the continuing fund was increased and its use to cover costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and rentals for transmission facilities was authorized. The purchase of power was justified at that time as a necessary adjunct to the marketing of the hydroelectric power. In an opinion dated July 15, 1949, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior stated that the marketing of the hydroelectric power, in accordance with section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, necessitated interchange agreements under which the Administration might during certain accounting periods purchase more than it sold.

In 1950 Congress learned that the continuing fund was being used indirectly to finance the construction of generating and transmitting facilities. The Rural Electrification Administration made $66 million worth of loans for generating and transmitting facilities, the feasibility for such loans being dependent on agreements with Southwestern Power Administration. As soon as Congress learned that Southwestern Power Administration funds were being used indirectly to finance these facilities, Congress in 1951 amended the continuing fund law to limit expenditures therefrom to amounts authorized annually by Congress. Congress thereby sought to reassert control. Congress has at all times tried to limit SPA, as nearly as possible, to the use of existing facilities in marketing the hydroelectric power, and to prevent the construction of a great public power project.

The hearings on the bill now before us disclosed that REA once again is looking to arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration to provide feasibility for loans to construct power facilities. The committee therefore felt it necessary to restate the law and thc congressional policy.

That is what is involved.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished friend. However, the language which continues, from the first of the paragraph, arouses a fear in the minds of REA leaders and users that it would, in effect, make a change in the law.

Picking up the language:

The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used—

And adding the words—

to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility——

Mr. ELLENDER. "If."

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes—

if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration.

It is said that the language might cause an adverse effect on contracting which must be done with an ordinary distributing REA cooperative. These must contract for the use of power, and by contracting they make the loan more feasible, if they expect an extension of their distribution system or the "heavying up" of their lines.

The use of the words, "feasibility of a Federal loan" particularly works against distribution cooperatives, which feel that this would severely hamper their opportunity to make contracts necessary in the normal course of their operations.

The language is not subject to amendment on the floor. I hope the language can be discussed in conference with the House conferees and the conclusion reached, after careful study of the language, that it would not be detrimental to the preference users and their right to public power, as the Federal Flood Control Act intended. If the language needs to be modified, I hope it will be so reported when the bill comes back from conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator knows that I have always been for REA.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has been a pioneer in that field.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am a great advocate of the REA. It is handled by the committee of which I am the chairman.

At the moment we are seeking to prevent any increase in the agitation now going on throughout the country in respect to REA loans being made on a commercial basis. Several bills are now pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Up to now hearings have not been held on them.

It is my belief that the REA has been doing a good job; and I should like to have that continue.

In the budget for fiscal 1947 $23 million was asked by the Department of the Interior to begin construction of a system of powerplants and transmission facilities to firm the power generated at various dams. A program was presented which indicated that a grid would be established throughout various parts of the country. Congress rejected this plan, since SPA was created only to market surplus power from Federal reservoirs, not to build a public power empire. In 1949 and 1950, SPA and REA tried to develop such a system without coming to Congress and obtaining its approval. Instead they worked out an arrangement whereby REA was to loan the money to build the grid and facilities and the SPA was to lease and operate the transmission facilities and purchase all the power. We amended the continuing fund law in 1951 to prevent this type of arrangement by making SPA come to Congress for annual approval of expenditures from the fund.

What we are doing now is to restate what is the law.

As the Senator knows, this language in the report would not change the law. It is only a suggestion that REA follow the law as we understand it. In my opinion, it would not in any manner affect the ability of the cooperatives to proceed to do what they desire, provided that in obtaining loans they would not be entirely dependent on the Southwestern Power Administration in order to be able to make sufficient funds to repay the loans.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true, but I think the entire dependency would be a matter that should be established. They are, of course, dependent upon the amount of power that is distributed. The extension of the benefits of the SPA power to cooperatives many miles away is important to the existence of cooperatives, particularly in places such as the western part of my State, where there is what has been called a power desert.

The need for power generated at those dams, which can also be interchanged between the power-generating facilities and certain REA's to feed into the southwest power network, gives a balance of potential that makes for better service in areas where that power would not otherwise be available.

Mr. ELLENDER. This provision would not have any effect on that situation. The committee report reiterates the preference to be given to cooperatives in the sale of power generated at those dams.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are very anxious to be sure of that. If the Senator, as he goes to conference, will discuss this matter, I am certain that, from his record of help to the REA's from the beginning, it will be most helpful to us if he makes sure there is to be adequate power and an adequate sharing of the power.

Mr. ELLENDER. I give the Senator that assurance.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator for that assurance.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to join in praise of the REA. I consider it one of the great achievements of the last quarter of a century, created by the administration of President Franklin Roosevelt. As a result, electricity was brought into remote areas, rural areas, which never had had it at prices its people could afford to pay. The REA has been of great value to my State of Alaska where we have a dozen REA cooperatives and I know to other States. I hope nothing will be done to interfere with its efficient functioning.

Mr. ELLENDER. If I thought that would happen, I would never have consented to this provision.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Carolina for a question, if I may do so without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, in regard to rural electrification, having served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the Senator from Louisiana when this matter was before us many times, and knowing of his attitude toward rural electrification, I am sure he will see that nothing is done to injure rural electrification in any way.

Personally, I feel very close to rural electrification. It may be of interest to know that South Carolina was made a guinea pig, so to speak, in regard to rural electrification. South Carolina was given $100,000 to make a survey for rural electrification, before the Rural Electrification Act was passed from a national standpoint. Naturally, we feel very close to rural electrification. I know the Senator from Louisiana will do nothing that would injure it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina for his remarks. I return the compliment to him.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask to call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 3, line 18, to strike the figure "$20,625,300" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,600,000".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would reduce the amount of appropriations for general investigations by $25,000, from $20,625,000 to $20,600,000.

The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate the Skunk River and Squaw Creek engineering survey itemized on page 5 of the House report.

I feel dutybound to offer this amendment on the basis of information which I shall present to the Senate, so that the Senate may decide whether or not this item should be approved.

The only trace of justification which can be found for this survey is that the dams on the upper reaches of the Skunk River would allegedly provide flood control. However, there appear to be no supporting date and information indicating a need for such a flood control project. For example, I am reliably advised that the industrial development area of Ames, Iowa, which is supposed to be primarily concerned, has not had a flood since 1944, and that this was not serious.

In 1951 a study was made by the Corps of Engineers of this proposed project. The corps made a preliminary recommendation that two reservoirs be constructed—one on the Skunk River and the other on Squaw Creek. However, the corps advised that before any final determination would be made regarding the feasibility of the project, seven questions would have to be answered; namely:

First. Feasibility and probable cost and benefits for transmittal channel rectification and other practicable local flood protection measures, including levees in downstream areas and possible use of small automatic discharge dams on important tributaries.

Second. Siltation above and below the possible dam sites, including such information as is available on the source of silt and the influence the dams would have on channel silting with reference to downstream water supplies, particularly at Oskaloosa.

Third. Land and property values in the flood plan where benefits from reservoir operation are granted.

Fourth. Flood frequencies an benefited reaches.

Fifth. Stage-area inundated curves and supporting data for the estimates of losses nad benefits.

Sixth. Effect of reservoir modification on specific floods and on flooded area.

Seventh. Amount of land enhancement and the proportion of cost that local interests should bear.

These questions have not been answered, and it would require a study by the corps to provide the answers. Meanwhile, because of an apparent lack of local interest, nothing has been done to authorize such a study until now.

Of major concern to the city of Ames is prompt completion of Interstate 35, and of major concern to Iowa taxpayers is that this completion be without undue cost. Should one or more reservoirs be constructed under the Skunk River or Squaw Creek project, the grading elevation for Interstate 35 would have to be increased by from 10 to 14 feet, thus entailing considerable additional expense.

Moreover, if this project goes forward, it will mean delay in completion of Interstate 35. Within 60 days the Iowa State Highway Commission is scheduled to commence right-of-way acquisition. It will take months for the Corps of Engineers to complete its survey and for Congress to determine whether or not the project is to be approved and appropriations provided—possibly years. If Interstate 35 is to go forward on schedule, rights-of-way acquisition must proceed on schedule.

If it be suggested that the Iowa State Highway Commission can proceed in its acquisition of rights-of-way, it should be called to the Senate's attention that these will entail payment of severance damages; whereas, later on, if this project should ever be approved, the Corps of Engineers would acquire whole farms, so that the previous payment of severance damages would have been wasted—thus increasing the cost to taxpayers unnecessarily.

Because of the apparent lack of danger from recurring floods or from serious floods, it would appear that the cost-benefit ratio on such a proposed flood control project would not be favorable.

There has been no initiation of this flood control project for further study by the city of Ames, the Ames Chamber of Commerce, the Ames Industrial Development Corp., or Iowa State University; and I have received not one telephone call, letter, or conversation requesting support for it; but I have received some objections.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the matter referred to by the distinguished Senator from Iowa relates to survey funds. In the past our committee has followed the policy of not earmarking any of the moneys provided for navigation or flood control surveys. But the House follows the practice of earmarking quite a few surveys. In this instance the House, as I recall, earmarked money for 30 unbudgeted surveys. It is a practice the Senate does not follow.

Since there is opposition by the Senator from Iowa on the subject matter, I would be willing to accept the amendment so as to put the matter in conference, and present it to the House conferees.

As I said, the money the Senate committee recommended for surveys is not earmarked for any particular project. We leave it for the engineers to do that. It may be that we can do something about this matter on which the House has acted. Perhaps the House will agree to strike the survey to which the Senator has referred, or, if there is sufficient evidence produced showing how the money is to be used. I assure the Senator that we will use all the information necessary to insure that the subject is adequately treated in conference.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that statement by the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Iowa has undertaken to do a conscientious job, on rather short notice, in trying to ascertain the full background of information on this project, and in searching through the hearings for an answer which justifies inclusion of this item in the bill. I thought the Senate would be apprised of the information, or, I should say, lack of firm data to support this item, and also the information which I have presented.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, with respect to surveys, very little justification is submitted to the subcommittee of either the House or the Senate. The reason for that is that the engineers are usually provided with whatever funds are necessary so that they can investigate the feasibility of the project. When it comes to providing money for planning or construction, the committees require detailed justifications before recommending the funds, and every dollar that is appropriated must be fully justified. That is not true with respect to surveys.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that fact. However, I am sure the Senator from Louisiana did not understand during the hearing on this particular item that there was a problem regarding Interstate 35, which might be delayed, and is of great concern to the people of this community, plus the fact that it was looked at first more than 12 years ago, and nothing has been done since that time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Should the Senate adopt the Senator's amendment, I suggest that he furnish me as much information as he can, and I will take the matter up in conference and do whatever I can.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, which I ask to have considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 28, it is proposed to strike out lines 11 through 22, as follows:

TITLE IV

Funds appropriated to the President

Public Works Acceleration

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this amendment is calculated, as was suggested a little earlier this afternoon, to strike from the bill the $45 million which is proposed to be appropriated for the final installment of the accelerated public works program.

Congress originally authorized $900 million for this program. All but $50 million of that amount has been appropriated. What we are being asked to do now in connection with the $45 million is to appropriate the balance of the authorization, less about $5 million, which presumably is being withheld at this time to defray administration costs which may be encountered at a later time.

It will not be my purpose to go into much detail in arguing the merits of the amendment, because in my opening remarks on the bill as a whole, I went into great detail; nor will it be my purpose to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

By way of review, the record of the accelerated public works program is anything but brilliant. Certainly it has been one of some confusion. It has been a record that is often made in connection with a crash program, when a super agency is superimposed upon regular agencies to which the allocation of money is usually made.

The program has been administered in a discriminatory way. That has been demonstrated. The RECORD, as it will be printed, including the remarks I made earlier this afternoon, will demonstrate that to be the fact. It has been discriminatory in at least one instance. It will be discriminatory in similar instances, and certainly can be expected to be discriminatory in other instances. It is a program which bypasses Congress and the regular congressional procedures in connection with the appropriation of funds. It certainly is an abdication of the power which Congress holds most dear, namely, the control of the purse strings.

The final argument that I suggested a little earlier in my remarks is that it would be premature to make an allocation and to appropriate at this time for this purpose. Not more than 30 minutes before I rose to be recognized to discuss the bill, an announcement was made that hearings would commence tomorrow or the next day on two authorization bills for additional authorizations for the accelerated public works program. One of these bills has been pending since March of this year; the other bill has been pending since July. Neither branch of this Congress has acted on authorizations for additional funds for this program, indicating that in all fairness to ourselves Congress should await the hearings on the merits of the appropriation bills for this program as of now. If the sense of Congress, following those hearings is that we should proceed, very well; that will be the decision. It might be said that we should do this and await the hearings for the additional appropriations. It is anticipated that there will be a deficiency appropriation bill brought up some time in January, and that the funds could be considered at that time.

If in the meantime the hearings have been completed and a decision made on the merits of the authorization bill.

The hearings on the pending bill indicated, furthermore, that as of the end of October, there was actually obligated $245 million of the $450 million appropriated in the second appropriation, and all of the first part had been obligated. It is not as though they were without funds, although a great many applications have been made for community facilities which the administration of these funds is not reaching.

Therefore, I ask that the amendment be adopted, and the $45 million be deleted, which would consist of striking title IV of the pending bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to. A good case was made for the expenditure of the $45 million. This appropriation should have no connection with any pending legislation authorizing the expenditure of additional funds for this purpose.

As I indicated earlier this afternoon, the money will be used primarily to generate work in areas which have a great deal of unemployment. It is true that the committee has written into the report a hope that half of the funds should be used for community facilities, but it is left to the Administrator to use the money where he can best take care of unemployment.

Inasmuch as Congress has already enacted the authorization, which was done last year, and since the remaining $45 million is authorized, and in accord with the basic authorization, I hope that the Senate will reject the amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I merely wish to second the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana and to say, regretfully, that I find myself in total disagreement with the points raised by the Senator from Nebraska. I know of no program which is more vital in the United States today than the program of putting people to work. Accelerated public works is one means of doing that.

The Senator from Nebraska raised the objection that somehow or other Congress was being circumvented by having projects go through without an authorization and by the accepted and established congressional procedures. That is precisely the criticisms I have made against the foreign aid legislation, where it is done on a gigantic scale, with billions of dollars being voted with no control by Congress.

Here we are dealing with a program for the benefit of the American people. It is about time that we considered the importance and the interest of the American people as first and foremost. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 344 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 18, it is proposed to change "$187,425,000" to "$182,425,000" and on page 12, line 5, insert the following: *"Provided:* That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the Glen Elder unit in Kansas."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do not expect to ask for a rollcall vote on this amendment. However, following the disposition of this amendment, I shall call up another amendment, very closely related to it. On that amendment, I shall ask for a rollcall vote.

I have offered the amendment because I think this project is the most wasteful I have seen since I became a Member of the Senate. Last year I went into great detail about the project. I shall not detain the Senate at any length today, because on Friday I spoke at some length and explained my position on the project. This afternoon, I shall briefly summarize my position and ask for a voice vote on the amendment.

The amendment would eliminate from the public works appropriation bill $5 million proposed to be spent for the construction of the Glen Elder project in Kansas.

The Glen Elder project is primarily for flood control, and secondarily for irrigation, in western Kansas. The project is justified based on a 2½-percent discount ratio and a fantastic 100-year life. Of course, when these two components are brought together, almost anything can be justified. In spite of that advantage, this project has only a 1.34 benefit-cost ratio, with an extraordinarily low 2½-percent discount, as I have said. If the discount were a little higher—if it were, for example, at a level at which the Government actually had to pay for the money it borrows—4 percent—the benefit-cost ratio would be negative. The benefit would be substantially less than the cost.

The project was authorized in 1944 in a one-line authorization that authorized several hundred projects. At that time it was estimated that the Glen Elder project would cost $17 million. Last year the estimate was that it would cost $60 million. This year, the estimate is that it will cost $76 million.

The President spoke eloquently and convincingly when he addressed Congress a few days ago on the importance of economy in Government, particularly the difficulties which he has referred to as the built-in spending provisions in the law.

What this item would do if we proceed with the appropriation would be to "build in" over the next several years many millions of dollars the President would be compelled to ask and the Congress to give for the construction of a project which is about as wasteful as can be imagined.

The flood control benefits of this project are marginal, at best. They would provide control over a relatively small proportion of the water that endangers an area some 200 miles away from where the dam would be located. But if the flood control aspects of the project are questionable, the irrigation aspects are frankly ridiculous. The Glen Elder project would provide for the irrigation of land which would bring into production $1 million of additional feed grain surpluses. At present we have approximately $3 billion—three thousand million dollars—worth of feed grain in surplus. We are spending $1.3 billion a year on our feed grain program. The Glen Elder project would aggravate and increase that cost at the rate of $1 million a year. This is really Alice-in-Wonderland economics. We would spend scarce dollars to use scarce water to bring into production an additional surplus of feed grains that we do not need.

I recognize that there is courtesy in the Senate and a respect for other Senators; and that when a project develops in the State of a Senator, we honor that project whenever we can. I also recognize that the two Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. PEARSON] are not only distinguished and popular Senators, but are two of the finest, most able Members of this body. I know they have fast friends on both sides of the aisle. But I believe this is not a matter of friendship; it is a matter of realism. It makes absolutely no sense for the Senate, if it believes in economy at all, to spend $76 million, much of which will be used to bring into production feed grain that is not needed.

To put the icing on the cake, the farmers in the area which would be irrigated have made sworn affidavits, which I have seen and which I have, including their names and addresses. These I have placed in the RECORD. Ninety percent of the farmers in this area who own 85 percent of the land that would be irrigated have indicated their opposition to the project. Eighty percent of the farmers who own land that would be irrigated have indicated that under no circumstances will they join the irrigation district or irrigate their land. The farmers must think Congress has gone mad if it plans to go ahead with a project which they do not want, and of which they would be the only beneficiaries; a project which would cost an enormous amount of money, bring additional land and additional crops into production, and impose a heavy cost on the Treasury and the taxpayers over a long period.

Finally, if Congress proceeds with this $76 million project by appropriating $5 million today, the case on this project will be closed and locked tight. We won't be able to stop it. Last year Congress appropriated a few hundred thousand dollars to begin the planning. I think that amount has not been completely spent; certainly it is not lost. It would be a relatively modest loss if Congress decided not to proceed with the project. But once we spend $5 million and start construction, the expenditures for construction will be irrevocably and permanently committed for the project; there will be no turning back.

I hope that my amendment No. 344 will be accepted. I ask for a voice vote on the amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that the Senator from Wisconsin spoke last year for a period of 10 hours concerning the Glen Elder project. At that time, the committee had recommended the project.

I admit that the benefit-cost ratio is rather low; but by the expenditure of the additional sum beyond that appropriated last year, to which the Senator has referred, the program would be one to hold back water, and would increase the benefit-to-cost ratio to 1.34 instead of 1.18. Most of the money would be spent for flood protection, especially in the vicinity of Kansas City.

This is a worthwhile project. From all I can understand, it comes under reclamation, which is handled by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. The cost to the Government will be for flood control only, which amounts to about $56 million of the entire $76 million. The rest of the sum would be reimbursable to the Federal Government on a long-term basis.

I hope the Senate will maintain the same position it took last year on this proposal.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana said that the irrigation part of the program would be repaid to the Federal Government on a long-term basis. Would the irrigators pay interest on this money?

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They would pay no interest?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. When would the repayment be made?

Mr. ELLENDER. Within 40 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Government would have to pay interest on the money it borrowed to put into the project. The

interest would be calculated on the amount the Government would pay of the $17 million cost of the irrigation aspect of this project more than $15 million or about 90 percent of the cost listed in the bill would be the cost to the Federal taxpayer, the general taxpayer, because the interest would accrue to that extent over the long period during which the payment would be made on the principal, and that interest would never be repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. The policy the Senator is talking about was determined by Congress many years ago. Many projects were constructed in that manner. The revenues that have come to the Federal Government because of the development of the land by way of income taxes have been great—much more than the cost of building the projects. It is my belief that the entire irrigation program has in the past paid off very handsomely; and I believe the program should be continued.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the issue presented by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was raised, I believe, some time last year, on the occasion when we had before us the authorization bill which included this project. At that time the facts in this connection were brought out in great detail—including the philosophy in regard to the reimburseable features of reclamation advances of this kind, as well as the engineering part, consisting of flood-control protection. Economic justification was made at that time, and has improved since then.

On the strength of the authorization, certain actions have been taken, as I understand, by some of those living in the area.

Mr. President, in connection with such matters there must come a time—after due debate, discussion, and showing—when a decision will be made, and there must come a time when it will be made firmly.

It is submitted that that time has passed, and that Congress has committed itself to construction of the project, after due deliberation and the submission of many pertinent facts, all of which have stood up well under the standards which were established long ago for such projects.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be rejected.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall speak only briefly on this amendment.

I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the remarks of the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in reference to this project, which has been authorized by Congress, and has been studied by the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation and by the engineers of the Corps of Army Engineers. This project has been approved continuously, and last year an authorization was made for an appropriation by Congress.

At this time, I should like to read into the RECORD a telegram I have received in regard to the amount of work done on the project:

BELOIT, KANS., *December 7, 1963.*

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As of November 30, 1963, on Glen Elder project, latest Bureau of Reclamation data shows they have spent $1,018,000 for construction, $720,000 for investigation. They have 22 signed contracts for land acquisition, involving 1,900 acres fee land and 800 acres easement land. These 22 contracts represent a commitment of $572,000 about half of which has been paid out. Twelve families have made financial commitments to purchase other properties. Impossible to estimate economic disruption to this community if funds are held up as it would touch almost everyone.

DEAN D. HADDOCK,
Executive Secretary, Solomon Valley Flood Control Association.

I mention this because this project is underway; this is not the first appropriation for it. There is a $5 million item to carry on this project; and extensive plans have been made by the Bureau to carry it on.

The Senator from Wisconsin has mentioned the increased production of feed grains which might result. However, he failed to state that the project will take out of production the most fertile areas there, located above the dam. In short, the construction of the dam would take out of production a number of very productive acres of land located within the site of the reservoir.

I would be less than frank if I did not state that this argument is causing great concern in that area. I know the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is familiar with that situation.

On page 48 of the report the following is set forth:

Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

I wish to comment briefly on that point, because I hold in my hand a letter from Representative Robert Dole, who represents that district in the House of Representatives. In his letter he expresses some concern in regard to possible changes in the plans in regard to the fish and wildlife area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, in addition to the statement I have read, which is a part of the committee report, because I, too, share the same feeling in regard to the land purchased in fee simple for this project.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.

Re Glen Elder unit.
Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The committee report (p. 48) accompanying H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill for 1964, contains the following language: "None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes." I requested this language, as there were plans to acquire 13,527 acres in consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning, some to be acquired in fee and some covered by flowage easements. This is attributed to a revised interdepartmental policy agreed upon by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of the Army in February 1962.

Frankly, I could see no reason for removing this much acreage from local tax rolls, nor devoting this much acreage for fish and wildlife purposes. I would point out that those persons affected are not opposed to negotiating an easement in most instances, but do oppose the land being taken in fee.

At any rate, I felt inclusion of the above language in the report, along with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 21177, November 19, 1963, would clarify any question which might arise; and just as an additional precaution I directed a question to Congressman CANNON, and he affirmed my position that none of the land in the Glen Elder project would be taken in fee for fish and wildlife purposes.

On Tuesday of this week I asked Bill Kats to make certain the Bureau of Reclamation was in accord with what I still consider to be the proper interpretation of the legislative history. In his discussions with Mr. Casey and Mr. Palmer of the Bureau of Reclamation, he was advised of many things, including a statement by Mr. Casey that still another revision in policy had been made late this summer; hence, all the land I had referred to except 1,400 acres would now be needed in fee for flood control. In other words, simply by changing the designation of what the acreage would be used for, my efforts had been completely circumvented.

So you may be fully informed, I am enclosing and attaching hereto copy of a statement prepared earlier this year which contains the following: "From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres." Also attached is a copy of the report containing the language I have referred to on page 48, a copy of my comments in the RECORD, and a letter signed by William I. Palmer, Acting Commissioner, dated December 5, which, in my opinion, is a weak attempt to avoid the clear intent of my efforts.

Let me make it clear there is no misunderstanding on my part, but because of the interpretation contained in Mr. Palmer's letter, it would be appreciated if you would make additional legislative history when the Senate bill is debated on the floor. If this is not feasible, I certainly intend to do whatever may be necessary to clarify the unwarranted interpretation when the bill goes to conference.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] in regard to this project.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas explain to me how it is possible to have any irrigation benefits from this project? Yet the irrigation benefits are said to constitute over $500,000 a year. How can there be irrigation benefits if, as I think the Senator said, the land taken out of production is more fertile than the land which would be irrigated? If this is true, there is no justification, none, for the $17 mil-

lion the Federal Government would invest; none.

Mr. CARLSON. I thought the Senator from Wisconsin was arguing that the production of feed grains would be greatly increased.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. The Senator from Wisconsin should give some thought to the thousands of acres which would be taken out of production in the reservoir area.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I have available some tables which show the acreage both before and after the project is completed. I think the production of wheat would be somewhat decreased, but there would be a great increase in the production of virtually every other feed grain.

Mr. CARLSON. I know this area. I live within 25 miles of it, and I know the production of this land. When 21,000 acres of land below the dam are irrigated and when approximately 20,000 acres of land above the dam are taken out of production, it will not be possible to avoid damaging the production, at least in the overall, total view.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Then is it correct to state that there will be no irrigation benefits from the project?

Mr. CARLSON. Not until the people establish an irrigation area by voting for it. When they do, of course there will be irrigation. This project is no different from other irrigation projects in the Nation, and I hope we do not today change the established policy.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the people do not vote for it—and I think the Senator knows they will not vote for it—it is foolish to spend this amount of money, $17 million of which is for irrigation.

Mr. CARLSON. But all this money is for construction of the dam and reservoir.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am speaking now about my second amendment, which relates to the technical aspects.

But I am delighted to hear the Senator say that advantage would not be taken of the irrigation opportunities. It fully confirms my argument and makes the irrigation expenditures of this project senseless.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I compliment my senior colleague [Mr. CARLSON] and the majority of the committee and the minority of the committee for the fine work done.

Certainly no one appreciates more than I do the great effort and great dedication displayed and the work done by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], in behalf of his convictions in connection with this matter. Last Friday, he made a speech in which he presented his point of view and set forth in great detail his arguments. As I read that speech, I think the presentation he made may be reduced to three points, as follows:

First, that the project was improperly authorized.

Second, that the cost-benefit ratio is inadequate to support the project.

Third, that the project does not meet with the will of the people of Kansas and the governmental authorities affected.

I have set forth as concisely as I could a response to those arguments by the Senator from Wisconsin, as follows:

The Senate has before it two amendments to the public works appropriations bill which relate to the Glen Elder Reservoir project in north-central Kansas. This is a project to be constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation on the Solomon River, a tributary of the Kansas River. I wish to comment briefly on these two amendments offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin.

The first amendment proposes the deletion of the entire appropriation. The second would prohibit the use of any funds appropriated to provide irrigation capacity in the reservoir.

Mr. President, I oppose both of these amendments. In the course of the Senate's consideration of this proposition in the 87th and now in the 88th Congress, the able Senator from Wisconsin has discussed the details of the Glen Elder project extensively on the Senate floor. In addition, his arguments were forcefully made to the Appropriations Committee and the Reclamation Subcommittee. They have been thoroughly presented with great conviction but rejected by the Senate and the appropriate committees.

It is not my intention to discuss the points raised in detail. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I feel compelled to reply in general to the Senator's contentions. The arguments in support of the amendments may be reduced to three in number. First, the project was improperly authorized. Second, the cost-benefit ratio is inadequate to support the project, and third, the people of Kansas do not want the project.

First, the validity of the authorization: The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin correctly stated that the Glen Elder project was originally authorized for construction by the Flood Control Acts of 1944 and 1946. This is the same basic legislation which has resulted in the initiation of more than $3 billion in water resource development by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. In spite of this fact, however, and in order to satisfy the very quetsion which the senior Senator from Wisconsin has now raised, the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate conducted an exhaustive inquiry into the adequacy of this authorization in 1962. The committee, then under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], heard detailed testimony and, by its final disposition, indicated its satisfaction with the original authorization.

Further, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Congress satisfied itself as to the question of authorization last year when it approved a $750,000 appropriation for Glen Elder in the face of this same argument. I might point out that as of November 30, 1963, the Bureau of Reclamation has spent over $1 million on Glen Elder. I am advised the Bureau has signed 22 contracts for land acquisition, involving 1,900 acres of fee land and 800 acres of easement land. These contracts represent a commitment of $572,000, about half of which has been paid out. Twelve families have already made financial commitments to purchase other property. A failure to proceed with this project at this point would impose considerable hardship on many persons in the area and an expensive loss to the Federal Government.

Next, with respect to the validity of the cost-benefit ratio calculation: I recognize with the Senator from Wisconsin that there are many questions which can be raised about the soundness of the present method of calculating costs and benefits by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Last year I offered to join the Senator in supporting a review of this yardstick. I repeat my statement of last year, however, that there is no justification for singling out this one project for deletion or for modification on these grounds while all other projects approved on the same method of computing the cost-benefit ratio are permitted to proceed.

Finally, it is contended that the people in Kansas, and especially those in the immediate area of the Glen Elder project, do not want the reservoir constructed. Mr. President, the Glen Elder project was reviewed by the Kansas Water Resources Board and was approved by the Governor of Kansas. I have discussed this project with many people in the area and downstream from the damsite as far as the junction of the Kansas River with the Missouri. There is opposition, there is qualified support, and there is endorsement. The range of opinion parallels that associated with any similar project in Kansas or any State. Every Senator here has had experience with these same circumstances.

In the final analysis one must judge the merits of the program along with the desires of the people directly and indirectly affected. In this light, it is my judgment that this project has the support of the people of Kansas and it should go forward unencumbered by the proposed amendments.

I would like to make one concluding point in urging the rejection of the amendment to prohibit the inclusion of irrigation capacity in this reservoir. The natural terrain of Kansas does not lend itself to the construction of a large number of water retention facilities. We must, therefore, be certain that when a site is chosen, the construction is planned so that it will be put to the greatest possible use. I would emphasize that there is no present plan to use the irrigation capacity which is designed into the Glen Elder project. However, to exclude the irrigation capacity from the reservoir would be to underutilize the site and in all likelihood prohibit any future utilization of this resource.

In this connection it is important to note that since the original Bureau studies on this project were submitted to the Congress, the Corps of Engineers has completed and the Congress has approved a revised Kansas River Basin plan which has enhanced the benefit factor of this reservoir for flood control purposes. The availability of this reservoir as a re-

tention dam for floodwaters will permit downstream reservoirs, four of which are still to be built, to be drained and their capacity restored as protection for heavily populated areas. This function of Glen Elder will be taken into consideration in the preparation of plans for the reservoirs yet to be built by the Corps of Engineers and I think we can safely assume will be reflected in their costs. Thus, even if the irrigation factor was eliminated as the amendment proposes, the cost would not be reduced as significantly as my friend and colleague from Wisconsin contends since the flood control function now assigned the reservoir would require substantially the same design.

In conclusion, this project is economically justified for flood control, municipal and industrial water supply, pollution abatement, and other legitimate purposes even if no benefits are ever realized from irrigation. Further, on this basis and in view of the extensive review and the present commitments already associated with this project, I would urge that the Senate reject the two amendments which would, in effect, destroy the project.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALTERS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 343

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 343, as follows:

On page 12, line 5, add the following: "*Provided further*, That no funds in this bill for the Glen Elder project shall be used for irrigation purposes."

Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment I have called up provides that none of the funds included in the $5 million appropriated for the Glen Elder project shall be spent for irrigation purposes. There is some question about the flood control aspect of the dam. Congress has approved it, and, although I disagree vigorously, most Senators seem to agree that it is worthy.

However, there can be no question that it is almost an inconceivable waste of money to appropriate funds for the $17 million for irrigation to bring more feed grain into production. The Senator from Kansas has said that in his judgment the project would not do that because land which is fertile and productive will be taken out of production. If that is the case, it seems to me that adoption of the Proxmire amendment would provide a golden opportunity to save $17 million. If the amendment were agreed to, it would mean that $17 million of the $76 million project would not, in the future, be expended.

It is true the senior Senator from Kansas feels that the irrigation money may not be spent for several years, but unless the amendment is written into the law, a commitment to spend the irrigation money could be made quite promptly. Some of the expenditure that will be made in the coming year may be for the purpose of eventual irrigation.

I repeat my argument because it pertains, one for one, to my argument against appropriating or permitting any money to be appropriated for irrigation.

First, the farmers whose lands would be irrigated are opposed to it. Perhaps some governmental authorities are not. Perhaps a mayor or the Governor of the State are for the project. Perhaps they have good reasons to be for it. But the fact is that the farmers whose land would be irrigated are against it. They oppose it. They have made their position as clear as they possibly can. I challenge the Senator from Kansas or anyone else to show any evidence that the people whose land would be irrigated want this project. The fact is they cannot do so because there is no such evidence. They know that farmers have not only signed affidavits against it, but 80 percent of the farmers have affixed notarized signatures to petitions opposing the formation of an irrigation district which is necessary in order to provide for irrigation.

As I have said, if the land were irrigated, it would increase the production of feed grains by a million dollars a year. I have indicated how big the surplus is—and it is fantastically big.

This farm program is one of the most frequently objected-to programs of the Federal Government. The project is the kind of project that makes the farm program even more criticized and even more vulnerable. On the unlikely assumption that the Solomon Valley farmers will take advantage of the irrigation, a realistic appraisal of the irrigation benefits of the Glen Elder project on the American economy as a whole must be zero.

This irrigation will impose a million dollar burden on the taxpayer to buy additional feed grain surpluses, plus heavy additional storage and interest costs.

I wish to make it clear that adoption of the amendment would not kill the project. The irrigation benefits would constitute only 20 percent of the calculated benefits. The irrigation costs are separable. The Bureau of Reclamation has made it clear that they are separable. If Congress permits no irrigation, the benefit-cost ratio would drop from 1.34 to 1 to 1.25 to 1. But in fact the benefit-cost ratio with irrigation banned would be far more honest and far more realistic because the benefits would not contain wholly unreal benefits of the full value of the surplus feed grain production.

Mr. President, on any basis the amendment certainly makes sense. I recognize that the people of Kansas—and certainly their Senators—should be the authoritative experts in the Senate on the full project and not merely on the flood control aspect of it. But when the farmers whose land would be irrigated do not want the project, have opposed it, and have gone to the trouble of going on record publicly against the project, and when we have a surplus of feed grains already, it makes no sense for us to increase that surplus.

So, in order that we might save $17 million, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

If any vote this year can be said to be an economy vote, it seems to me that the vote on the amendment will be one. On most of the economy votes, at least spending proponents could show some kind of service of some value to some group. Perhaps it has been a private group or perhaps a group that may or may not deserve the service. But in relation to this particular proposed expenditure of $17 million, service would result to no one.

The people who would presumably benefit would not. The taxpayer would have a triple burden. First, he would have to pay for the irrigation part of the project; second, he would have to pay for the procurement of $1 million a year of additional feed grains, and third, he pays additional storage costs and the interest costs forever.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator stated that the adoption of the amendment would not destroy the project. It is my understanding that the appropriation does not include funds for irrigation canals or for an irrigation district, but includes only funds relating to the capacity of the reservoir to handle irrigation demands if and when the need arises.

The question I wish to put to the Senator from Wisconsin is as follows: Although funds would be provided for construction of a reservoir which would have capacity for irrigation purposes, if the language to which the amendment refers is eliminated, would not its elimination conceivably raise a technical and legal point as to the jurisdiction of the bureau to continue work?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the answer would be in the negative. I have talked with Reclamation people and with officials in the Department of the Interior and they indicate that if Congress decided they did not want any money to be provided for irrigation, then there would be no reason why they could not continue the project. The project in the future would be a flood control project almost exclusively. Not exclusively, because there are some other benefits such as the recreational and the wildlife benefit, which are all minor, but the lion's share of the benefit is in flood control, as the Senator knows.

According to the word I have received from the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation, there is no reason why the proposed action should in any way inhibit the continuation of the project. Frankly I wish it would, but I am told there is no question that it will not.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to direct that same question to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the saving would not be $17 million, as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated. My information is that around $6 million

would be spent at the damsite to make irrigation possible. If, as, and when an irrigation district is created, then $11 million more would be required in order to build canals and related irrigation facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that what the Senator from Louisiana has said is correct, and I agree. My argument was not that there would be a saving of $17 million in the near future but eventually if we provide that in the future no money should be spent for irrigation, and that were a policy which would be accepted by our Government, then we would save $6 million now and $11 million in the future—a gross saving of $17 million. The $76 million project would be reduced to a $59 million project.

Mr. PEARSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, whether the irrigation project is not the basis of jurisdiction of the bureau to start and continue work on projects such as the one about which we are speaking?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is; but as I said earlier, most of the money being spent is for flood control.

Mr. PEARSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I advocate preservation of our precious water resources.

This proposal is one way to do it. I believe it would be foolish for the project to continue without placing at the damsite the necessary facilities to provide for irrigation, if, as, and when the people desire them.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have nothing further.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. WALTERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] is absent on official duty.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MECHEM], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER] is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 74, as follows:

[No. 265 Leg.]

YEAS—9

Byrd, Va.	Lausche	Proxmire
Dodd	Nelson	Thurmond
Gruening	Neuberger	Williams, Del.

NAYS—74

Aiken	Fulbright	McNamara
Allott	Goldwater	Metcalf
Anderson	Gore	Miller
Bartlett	Hart	Monroney
Bayh	Hartke	Morse
Beall	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bennett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Boggs	Hruska	Pearson
Brewster	Inouye	Pell
Burdick	Jackson	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Carlson	Jordan, Idaho	Saltonstall
Case	Keating	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Simpson
Clark	Kuchel	Smith
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Cotton	Long, La.	Stennis
Curtis	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dirksen	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Edmondson	McCarthy	Yarborough
Ellender	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	McGovern	Young, Ohio
Fong	McIntyre	

NOT VOTING—17

Dominick	Javits	Russell
Douglas	McGee	Smathers
Eastland	Mechem	Symington
Engle	Mundt	Tower
Hayden	Pastore	Walters
Humphrey	Robertson	

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in a colloquy which occurred a short while ago, by mistake, I made the statement that President Eisenhower recommended recoupment of expenses incurred in making inland waterways navigable. It was not President Eisenhower; it was President Kennedy, in his message of April 5, 1962. He specifically stated:

> The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's cost in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point a portion of President Kennedy's message of April 5, 1962, on this subject.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> 3. Inland waterways: Also in the interest of equality of treatment and opportunity, the principle of user charges should be extended to the inland waterways. A tax of 2 cents per gallon should be applied to all fuels used in transportation on the waterways. The recommended effective date, January 1, 1963, will alow time for review by the Interstate Commerce Commission of any adjustments that may be necessary in common carrier rates. This deferral is recommended even though the bulk of inland waterways traffic is carried by unregulated rather than regulated carriers.
>
> The new tax should include an exemption similar to the current exemption from taxation accorded to gasoline and ships supplies for vessels employed in the fisheries, foreign trade, or trade between the Atlantic and Pacific ports of the United States or between the United States and any of its possessions. Vessels in domestic trade using facilities and routes similar to those engaged in foreign trade, and vessels in coastal trade which are too large to use the intercoastal waterways, should also be exempted.
>
> This administration recognizes the responsibility of the Government to maintain and improve our system of inland waterways. Over $2 billion of Federal funds has already been invested in capital improvements. Expenditures for operating and maintaining the waterways are about $70 million annually, even though only a small fraction of the traffic consists of common carriers which serve all shippers and the general public. The users of the waterways include some of the largest and financially strongest corporations in the United States today, and it is surely feasible and appropriate for them to pay a small share of the Federal Government's costs in providing and maintaining waterway improvements.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, title III of H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill, 1964, provides appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission. It is noted that our Appropriations Committee recommends restoration of $61,355,000 of cuts made in the bill by the House. Included are $18,500,000 for "reactor development."

The House Appropriations Committee report which accompanied H.R. 9140 noted that it had deleted $33,548,000 of reactor development funds, including $3 million "budgeted for research and development and design assistance to utilities which may wish to construct power reactors."

In a Senate speech November 18, 1963, and in a letter of the same date to the chairman of our Appropriations Committee, I supported the position of the

House in accepting the report and recommendations of its Appropriations Committee. I question the advisability of our Government subsidizing the design and construction of investor-owned private nuclear powerplants which actually are commercial ventures.

I emphasize that I am not opposed to experimental work on reactors which the Atomic Energy Commission conducts as part of the valid national research effort.

My objection is to the AEC program of subsidizing the design, construction, and operation of large, nonexperimental identical nuclear powerplants, especially when such plants include already proven water type reactors.

We read in the report of our Appropriations Committee that included in its AEC fund restoration recommendations are:

> Three million dollars in operating costs for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. In restoring these funds, it is not the intention of the committee that such funds would be used for arrangements under which additional light-water reactors of already proven type could be constructed. On the contrary, the intention of the committee by this restoration, together with $12 million of funds budgeted under the "selected resources" program of the (Atomic Energy) Commission, is to provide an availability of $15 million for the purpose of entering into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types.

Perhaps this is justified as research. But the House report stated that these funds had been omitted by the House Committee on Appropriations from H.R. 9140 because—

> It is the committee's opinion that continuation of this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors since it has been demonstrated that they are now producing electric power at competitive costs at least in those areas of high conventional fuel cost.

Our Appropriations Committee not only recommends restoration of $3 million to apply on the operating costs of cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers; it would provide a fund of $15 million in this fiscal year "for the purpose of entering [AEC] into new cooperative arrangements for development of civilian power reactors of more advanced types." Thus it disagrees with the House which took the position that "this subsidy program is no longer necessary to stimulate the construction of power reactors."

And our Appropriations Committee disagrees with the House position that nuclear power reactors "are now producing electric power at competitive costs, at least in those areas of high conventional fuel cost." In contradiction, the Senate Appropriations Committee report includes this language:

> The committee is advised that competitive nuclear power, in any area of the country, is an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time.

The language of the Senate report has been expertly prepared in rebuttal to the House report. Competitive nuclear power may be "an expectation, rather than a demonstrable fact at this point in time." But civilian nuclear power industry spokesmen and those for equipment manufacturers are not as guarded in their evaluations of the competitive "expectation" and the status and future of the nuclear power program. They are ultraoptimistic.

In this connection, Mr. President, I pointed out in my November 18 letter to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee a position statement by the president of the Pennsylvania Electric Co. He has been quoted as having asserted that two of the large nuclear power plants listed to be built, with the aid of Government subsidies of over $12 million each for design assistance and fuel waiver, "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil fuel plants in the same location." And he further declared: "On a nonsubsidized basis, nuclear kilowatts will be competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States" by the time these subsidized nuclear power plants on the east coast and west coast go into operation in 1967–69.

In light of these conditions, and considering the tremendous potential for change inherent in them, it is distressing that the appropriations committees of the two bodies of Congress apparently are a considerable distance apart in their interpretations of the advice they have received concerning the status of the civilian nuclear power program.

Certainly, Mr. President, we are cognizant of the fact that advances in technology bring changes—sometimes drastic and very far reaching ones. Perfection of a civilian nuclear power industry would indeed create vast changes in the fundamental fuels and energy fields. In the drive for this perfection, with the Federal Treasury and a Federal agency spearheading the action, it seems to me that we must manifest a keener degree of interest in and understanding of the impacts and changes which will be brought about.

What of the impact on the fossil fuels industries, coal, oil, and gas; on investments in fossil fueled electric generating plants; on the railroad industry; on investments in TVA and numerous public and private hydroelectric facilities; and on millions of citizens and whole regions of our country?

There is an obligation on the part of the Congress to have answers—specific and detailed answers—to these questions while the data would have meaning and applicability.

We are told by some persons when we speak of these conditions that we are talking in terms of the past and not of the future—that we are "against progress." I emphatically disagree.

Mr. President, there is no real progress unless we meet the challenges and side effects of technological changes at each step along the way.

One of the difficulties which has plagued our country has been the inability or unwillingness to identify changes in the offing. Another has been failure to take positive and necessary counteractions after we have identified the problems induced by change. These difficulties and failures have contributed to human misery and economic dislocation in inordinate degree in some regions. Sometimes, as we have noted, a number of areas become so involved that we have recessions. And some of them linger as chronic problems which we often accentuate, rather than solve, by actions on such national legislation as that which embraces the civilian nuclear power activities.

We are at another of the crossroads.

In this matter of appropriations for the civilian nuclear power program we find identification difficulties. We must act on the basis of diametrically opposite interpretations of foundation facts and assumptions; one interpretation by the House, a differing one by the Senate as reflected in the Appropriations Committee report.

I am not disposed to complicate this dilemma by offering amendments. There doubtless will be a conference on this measure. I hope the conferees will find answers and provide the Congress with helpful interpretations and guidelines on the issue of Government financing for the civilian nuclear power program.

Frankly, Mr. President, there are far-reaching questions of policy involved which transcend the immediate matter of fiscal year 1964 appropriations now before us.

There is a need in greater degree than ever existed before that there be evolved by the Congress a national fuels and energy policy.

The complication is not merely a matter of divergent efforts involving competition between the fossil fuels for markets, nor is it only a question of private power versus public power forces in contention over where or whether hydroelectric projects shall be authorized and financed by the Congress.

The new force—civilian nuclear power—is coming more prominently and more sharply into focus, and perhaps with far more rapidity than had been anticipated and predicted. This poses problems as well as potential benefits for the Nation and its citizens.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has been one of the most outstandingly aggressive, useful, effective and successful instrumentalities of the Congress and, in fact, of the whole of our Government structure, in this century. Its energetic and knowledgeable chairman—the current chairman—the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and its former chairman, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] both have provided positive leadership.

It is a model which I would have had the Congress emulate when I offered on January 9, 1961 a concurrent resolution for the creation of a Joint Committee on National Fuels Study. I regret that the concurrent resolution approach did not endure and that we settled on nothing more than a committee study by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. After a brief flurry, that study seems to have perished.

Now the picture of the need for developing pertinent facts and forecasts on fuels and energy has a new dimension. There is, in my judgment, a real urgency that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be expanded into or supplemented by a Joint Committee on Fuels and Energy. This is not the time to discuss this subject in detail, but I will do so in the near future.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] for his kind comments about the work of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

It has always been a cornerstone of Joint Committee policy that the atomic energy program should be viewed objectively and in perspective. In this connection, over the past several months we have received correspondence from Mr. Joseph E. Moody, President of the National Coal Policy Conference. In his letter of August 30, 1963, addressed to the Chairman of the Joint Committee, and in a later letter of September 16, addressed to the Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee, Mr. Moody raised a number of questions concerning the civilian nuclear power program.

In order to obtain a complete picture of the facts, the Joint Committee asked the Atomic Energy Commission to comment on both letters, in the interests of presenting a complete record on this matter.

Again, I commend my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], for his continued attention to this important subject, not only from the standpoint of his State, but in relationship to the country as a whole.

I would like to insert in the RECORD the correspondence received from the National Coal Policy Conference, and the comments of the Atomic Energy Commission on these letters.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1963.

Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PASTORE: The National Coal Policy Conference speaks for the great industrial federation built around bituminous coal—the coal-producing companies, the United Mine Workers of America, the coal-hauling railroads, coal-consuming electric utilities, and manufacturers of coal mining machines and equipment. Members of this organization have invested more than $32 billion in plants and facilities, and provide a livelihood for more than 2.5 million Americans.

We, as an organization speaking for this vital force in our economy, are deeply concerned over the civilian nuclear power program as it is presently being conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission.

The private electric utility industry is now by far the largest single market for bituminous coal. The AEC program, the heart of which is massive subsidies, is directed toward replacing coal with nuclear power as the major source of the Nation's electric power supply. If all charges of a nuclear plant are fully applied we have reason to believe that the cost of making electricity would still be higher than making it with the basic fuels in spite of Government subsidization.

Therefore, we must speak out in opposition to the expenditure of taxpayers' funds on a program which cannot be justified and which, if not checked, could very well have the ultimate effect of wiping out this great American industry to the detriment of the national security.

For some reason, this massive subsidy program has not received the attention it rightfully deserves. We respectfully ask that you keep these following considerations in mind in connection with legislation which will authorize and appropriate funds for this program:

1. The AEC program no longer is concentrated on research and development work in connection with reactor prototypes. Rather, the chief and almost exclusive emphasis is now upon building large-scale, identical installations in the 400- to 500-megawatt range. The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operations these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even in the so-called high-fuel-cost areas.

2. There is no present or impending shortage of electric power to justify such massive Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program. True, the consumption of electric power is expected to quadruple by the year 2000, but all evidence proves that there will be sufficient fossil fuels, particularly coal, to meet this vastly expanded need. The Geological Survey has reported that present known reserves of coal, recoverable with present techniques and at approximately present prices, equals more than 200 billion tons, or 500 times current annual consumption. With continued improvement in the technology of coal transportation and even lower costs of production, there is every reason to anticipate that coal will be available to utilities at even lower costs in the years ahead, thus making it an even more attractive fuel. The conclusion is inescapable that what the civilian nuclear power program amounts to is the forced feeding of a new industry to use up the excess capacity developed by AEC over the years and to justify present appropriations and levels of operations.

3. To date, the Government has spent about $1.275 billion on the civilian power program. Its current budget is $216 million annually to further and expand the program of subsidy. Over the assumed life of one large nuclear plant (Connecticut Yankee Atomic) the total Government subsidy will amount to $45.6 million. Obviously, a nuclear plant with a subsidy of this magnitude will enjoy a tremendous advantage over privately built and privately financed coal-fired electric utility plants.

4. There is a matter of safety involved in the construction of nuclear powerplants, particularly in or near centers of population, which has not been settled. The proposals to build nuclear plants in the Borough of Queens in New York; near Atlantic City, N.J.; and in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas of California have created deep concern for the welfare of the residents of the areas. To quote an eminent scientist, "What is involved in atomic plants is the fact that accidents of one kind or another are an absolute certainty. They are inevitable. The difference here is that an accident associated with atomic power is of an altogether different magnitude than an accident associated with coal-fired generation plants."

The law requires private insurance of up to $60 million must be carried on atomic energy power plants, depending on the installed capacity. In addition each atomic plant must be indemnified in the amount of $500 million against accidents. The $60 million is the maximum amount that private insurance companies will write. Thus, since it is impossible (for the first time in the history of America) to obtain the enormous amount of insurance considered necessary for an atomic plant the Government supplies the $500 million indemnity at a nominal insurance premium of only $30 per year per thermal megawatt of installed capacity. For a plant of 140,000 electric kilowatts of capacity, this would come to about $12 or $13 thousand per year. This insurance alone proves the colossal danger of an atomic energy plant, particularly one close to centers of habitation.

Thus, it seems to us, in carefully reviewing the nuclear power program that the massive Government subsidies which have been, and are continuing to be spent, on the building of large non-experimental commercial plants cannot be justified.

The umbilical cord between the Government and the civilian nuclear power industry must be severed and this new industry must be made to stand on its own feet in the rough competitive power battle. Under such conditions, if nuclear power plants are needed and are feasible, they will be built, and without Government subsidy. But it is our belief, based upon a careful study of all relevant economic data, that without Government subsidy these plants would not be built nearly as rapidly and in as great numbers as they will be under the present AEC subsidy program.

We sincerely believe that it is unfair, and in contradiction of our free enterprise system, for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money—including taxes collected from coal and other fuels industries—to encourage through subsidy the construction of plants that threaten to undermine the future growth of—and perhaps eventually to destroy—coal and associated industries upon which so many people depend for a livelihood and which play such a vital role in our economy, and in addition endanger their lives and property.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
President.

NATIONAL COAL POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.

WASHINGTON, September 10.—Only one of the many forms of subsidy used by the Federal Government to encourage the development of a civilian nuclear power industry could have the effect of wiping out a market for 173 million tons of coal by 1980, a spokesman for the coal industry declared today.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, said this one subsidy—the providing of nuclear fuel to private utilities under Government financing rather than requiring the utilities to own, process, and reprocess their own fuel under more expensive investor financing will have a profound effect upon the growth rate of this new industry which will compete with coal as a fuel for the generation of electricity.

"The Atomic Energy Commission has estimated that under the present Government subsidy program, nuclear power will develop to the point where it will be the source for up to 20 percent of the Nation's electricity needs by 1980," Mr. Moody declared.

Dr. Theodore Baumeister, Stevens professor of mechanical engineering at Columbia University, has estimated that this 20-percent share would be reduced to only about 2 percent if Government financing is discontinued and the utilities are required to go into the private money market to provide their own financing.

It is easy to see what this means to the coal industry.

By 1980, it is estimated that total consumption of electricity will amount to 3,000 billion kilowatts.

If Government financing of nuclear fuel is continued and nuclear power meets 20

percent of this expanded requirement, as AEC predicts it will, this means a potential market for 192 million tons of coal will be replaced.

If this Government subsidy in the form of cheap financing is removed and the nuclear power share of the market is held to 2 percent, as Dr. Baumeister believes it would be without the financing subsidy, the replacement of coal markets would be 19 million tons.

Thus, the difference this one Government subsidy for nuclear power would make in the potential market for coal in the electric utility industry by 1980 amounts to 173 million tons.

The president of NCPC, which represents coal-producing companies, the United Mine Workers of America, coal-hauling railroads, coal-consuming electric utilities and manufacturers of coal-mining equipment, also pointed out that other Government subsidies used to encourage development of nuclear power in competition with private industry's fossil-fuel plants include reimbursement by AEC for design costs on large, nonexperimental plants, waiver of all costs for the use of Government-owned fuel during the first 5 years of a plant's life, continued renting of Government-owned fuel at charges far below what it would cost the utility to provide its own fuel, and Government-sponsored indemnity insurance at a fraction of what this insurance would cost if bought from private insurers.

"The Government has spent to date $1.275 billion on its civilian nuclear power program and it is continuing to spend at the rate of $216 million a year," Mr. Moody said.

"The sole purpose of these massive Government subsidies is to try to make nuclear power competitive with coal. We think it is wrong to use taxpayers' funds in this fashion.

"If nuclear power is needed, and if it can be produced economically, the necessary plants will be built by private enterprise without the necessity of vast Government subsidy.

"We have yet to see persuasive evidence that the plants are needed or can be made competitive with coal-fired plants.

"This is one vast Government expenditure that should be ended."

NATIONAL COAL
POLICY CONFERENCE, INC.,
Washington, D.C., September 16, 1963.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: A few days ago you received a letter which we addressed to every Members of Congress raising several pertinent questions relative to the wisdom of continued enormous Federal expenditures in an attempt to develop nuclear power to compete with coal. These subsidies become even more inexcusable in view of claims now being made by the industry that plants soon to be built will be competitive even without subsidies.

Naturally, the coal industry, which at present provides more than 200 million tons of coal annually to generate 67 percent of the Nation's steam-generated electricity, is alarmed over the threat posed by this Government subsidy to its future existence and to the 2.5 million persons dependent upon coal and allied industries for a livelihood.

In the beginning, Government subsidy for this new industry was justified on the grounds that only with Federal funds could the development of workable, practical reactors be achieved. Therefore, Congress authorized large appropriations for research and development work on reactor prototypes.

Unfortunately, the nuclear power program now has gone far beyond this original concept. Today the modified "Round Three" of the Atomic Energy Commission's cooperative power reactor demonstration program is concentrated for the most part on subsidizing the building of proven, large-scale projects to produce electricity for commercial sale, and which are economic to build only because of the size and extent of the Government subsidy. New experimental, prototype reactors are now being largely neglected.

This is happening even in the face of claims by a prominent electric utility official that nuclear plants can already compete with conventional fuel plants without subsidy. Mr. Louis H. Roddis, Jr., president of the Pennsylvania Electric Company, has stated that two commercial-size nuclear plants to be built on the east and west coasts "will produce electricity at a lower unit cost than fossil-fuel plants in the same location."

In a speech entitled "Nuclear Kilowatts Become Competitive" before the electric companies' public information program in Chicago recently, Mr. Roddis contended that water-cooled reactors slated for operation in 1967–68 will be "competitive with fossil fuel at 30 cents per million B.t.u.'s, indicating that nuclear kilowatts are competitive with fossil kilowatts in approximately one-half of the United States." He stated that this cost is "on a nonsubsidized basis."

In view of such an assertion by a respected and capable leader in the utility industry, there can certainly be no justification whatsoever for any additional expenditures of Government funds to build nuclear plants to produce power at the expense of a major existing industry.

And yet, even in the face of such claims from the industry that competitiveness has already been reached, the Atomic Energy Commission is pushing ahead with determination to see that additional large capacity nuclear plants, paid for in part by Government money and sustained in operation by Government subsidy, will be built. Dr. Glenn Seaborg, AEC Chairman, in testifying before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy this year, declared that the AEC proposes to "stimulate and support the utility industry in the construcion of 10 to 12 full-scale powerplants during the next dozen years to demonstrate the competitiveness of reactors of increasingly improved design." Please note that these reactors referred to are not experimental prototypes, which have, in the past, been the Government's justification for being in the atomic energy business in competition with private industry, but are merely larger and perhaps more efficient plants of a type already built. The only excuse used for this major continuing program is that the Government wants to prove that they can be competitive with fossil fuels—in other words that they can take over the utility market from coal.

Even if these plants fail to prove themselves competitive, it is important to recognize that they will be actual production plants, and not demonstrations, and will produce power to fill a market need which otherwise would be filled by plants burning fossil fuel. Twelve plants of about 500,000 kilowatts capacity, which is the size contemplated, would burn, during their estimated 20-year lifetime, the equivalent of 280 million tons of coal.

Many experts have predicted that by 1980 as much as 20 percent of the Nation's electric power needs will originate in nuclear plants. As the enclosed press release, which we recently issued, points out, this will be the equivalent of 190 million tons of coal annually.

The present AEC practice of subsidizing large, non-experimental and identical nuclear plants must be ended. The huge Government expenditures involved in the subsidies are not necessary. There is ample coal and other fossil fuels to generate increasing amounts of electricity to meet the Nation's needs for electric power. And certainly, if Mr. Roddis is correct, there can be no further justification for the Government continuing, by financial contributions, to stimulate the building of private nuclear electric plants. On behalf of the coal and allied industries, and the millions of people dependent on them, we earnestly urge you, as Members of Congress, to oppose any further appropriations to provide subsidies for the nuclear power reactor development program, and to reject the AEC's request for an extension of time in which to accept proposals to build plants under its so-called third round program with the help of Government funds.

I would appreciate any comment you might care to make.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH E. MOODY,
President.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., November 22, 1963.

Mr. JOHN T. CONWAY,
Executive Director, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. CONWAY: In response to your request of October 2, 1963, the following comments are furnished on the points raised by Mr. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., in his letter of August 30, 1963, to Chairman PASTORE, and his letter of September 16, 1963, to Vice Chairman HOLIFIELD.

LETTER TO CHAIRMAN PASTORE

1. "The AEC program no longer is concentrated on research and development work in connection with reactor prototypes. Rather, the chief and almost exclusive emphasis is now upon building large-scale, identical installations in the 400 to 500 megawatt range. The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operations these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even in the so-called high fuel-cost areas."

Comment: It is assumed that Mr. Moody is referring to the modified third round program which has resulted in assistance agreements with Connecticut Yankee and Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. The maximum amount of Government assistance agreed upon for these two project totals $14,050,000 for engineering design (about 8 to 9 percent of the costs to the utilities for plant construction) and $15,345,000 in the form of waiver of the normal AEC charges for the inventory of special nuclear material in the possession of the utilities through 5 years of plant operation. This inventory charge is frequently referred to by the AEC and others as a use charge, but it is important to note that all material used up, or consumed, in the operation is paid for in full by the utility. The inventory charge waiver for a limited period is granted only upon authorization by Congress and on the basis that the Government would obtain valuable information from the licensed activity in terms of research and development data and operating experience. Such information is, of course, made generally available to the public. However, after 5 years the reactor owner begins to pay the lease charge for this material in inventory. In contrast to the scope of the modified third round, the amount specifically directed to central station civilian power development included in the fiscal year 1964 budget requested of the Congress by the President is $153,763,000. (An amount of $244 million included in the President's budget message includes research and development programs contributing technical results to other Commission programs, in addition to the referenced amount of $153,763,000 which is spe-

cifically directed to the development of central station civilian power reactors.) A major portion of the Commission's annual expenditures on civilian power has been, and continues to be, devoted to research and development during the successive stages up to and including the design, construction and operation of prototype nuclear power plants. The relatively small incremental assistance to first, large-scale commercial plants is considered as the last step in the chain of development for the specific reactor type concerned. Commission adoption of the modified third round program was based on the belief that without Government assistance these plants either would not be built or that their construction would be delayed beyond the time considered desirable.

2. "There is no present or impending shortage of electric power to justify such massive Government participation in the civilian nuclear power program. True, the consumption of electric power is expected to quadrupie by the year 2000, but all evidence proves that there will be sufficient fossil fuels—particularly coal—to meet this vastly expanded need. The Geological Survey has reported that present known reserves of coal, recoverable with present techniques and at approximately present prices, equals more than 200 billion tons, or 500 times current annual consumption. With continued improvement in the technology of coal transportation and even lower costs of production, there is every reason to anticipate that coal will be available to utilities at even lower costs in the years ahead, thus making it an even more attractive fuel. The conclusion is inescapable that what the civilian nuclear power program amounts to is the forced feeding of a new industry to use up the excess capacity developed by AEC over the years and to justify present appropriations and levels of operations."

Comment: With respect to Mr. Moody's remarks on the availability of coal reserves to meet future growth in power demands, may I refer you to the discussion on this subject beginning on page 16 of the Commission Report to the President on Civilian Nuclear Power. On the basis of data obtained from several authoritative sources, the report concludes that if no supplemental forms of energy are utilized, we will exhaust our readily available, low-cost supplies of fossil fuels in from 75 to 100 years, and total supplies in from 150 to 200 years. However, long before the point of exhaustion of the fossil fuels, we would be obliged to taper off their use.

There are additional significant factors affecting the future use of fossil fuels. For example, as the report points out, fossil hydrocarbons are essential in the iron and steel industry and, furthermore, they represent a priceless heritage of complex molecular substances, the possible uses for which are only beginning to be realized. There is no presently known practical substitute for fossil fuels to power automobiles and aircraft, which will no doubt continue to increase in numbers. For these reasons we conclude that fossile fuels should be conserved. This can best be done through reasonably prompt efforts to supplement the use of fossil fuels in those applications for which technically satisfactory and reasonably economic substitutes can be utilized on a significant scale.

3. "To date, the Government has spent about $1.275 billion on the civilian power program. Its current budget is $216 million annually to further and expand the program of subsidy. Over the assumed life of one large nuclear plant (Connecticut Yankee Atomic) the total Government subsidy will amount to $45.6 million. Obviously, a nuclear plant with a subsidy of this magnitude will enjoy a tremendous advantage over privately built and privately financed coal-fired electric utility plants."

Comment: The maximum Commission assistance agreed upon for the Connecticut Yankee atomic project is actually $13.195 million of which $6.05 million is for design assistance and the balance for waiver of inventory charges on special nuclear materials. Perhaps the higher figure used by Mr. Moody includes an assumption of the difference between what it would cost the utility, over the plant lifetime, to maintain an inventory of special nuclear material under private ownership and the cost under the present system of lease from the Government at an annual inventory charge of 4¾ percent. (The value assigned by the Commission to special nuclear material, and the level of inventory charge, are based on full recovery of costs by the Government.) Lease is presently necessary since the Atomic Energy Act requires Government ownership, but there is legislation recommended by the Commission and now under Congressional consideration which would make private ownership permissible imemdiately, and mandatory after a transition period.

Incidentally, inventory charges represent only a small portion of the overall nuclear fuel cycle cost. Other items of cost which are borne by the utility include fabrication of fuel elements, burnup of fissionable material, reprocessing of spent fuel, and transportation.

4. "There is a matter of safety involved in the construction of nuclear power plants, particularly in or near centers of population, which has not been settled. The proposals to build nuclear plants in the Borough of Queens in New York; near Atlantic City, N.J.; and in the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas of California have created deep concern for the welfare of the residents of the areas. To quote an eminent scientist, 'What is involved in atomic plants is the fact that accidents of one kind or another are an absolute certainty. They are inevitable. The difference here is that an accident associated with atomic power is of an altogether different magnitude than an acident associated with coal fired generation plants.' "

Comment: The Atomic Energy Commission is responsible under the law for regulation of the use of atomic energy, including consideration of applications for nuclear power plant construction permits and operating licenses. Processing of applications involves review by up to as many as three different and independent groups: the AEC's hazards staff, the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, and a Safety and Licensing Board which conducts public hearings and is made up of three members, two of whom are technically qualified and one of whom is experienced in administrative proceedings. No such plants may be built or operated until we are convinced, by all the evidence on plant design, site and environs, method of operation, etc., that such construction and operation would not endanger public health and safety. The subject of safety was discussed in considerable detail by Commissioner Haworth in testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on April 5, 1963, in the course of its hearings on the development, state and growth of the atomic energy industry. I refer you to his testimony beginning on page 827 of the record of the hearings.

5. "The law requires private insurance of up to $60 million must be carried on atomic energy powerplants, depending on the installed capacity. In addition each atomic plant must be indemnified in the amount of $500 million against accidents. The $60 million is the maximum amount that private insurance companies will write. Thus, since it is impossible (for the first time in the history of America) to obtain the enormous amount of insurance considered necessary for an atomic plant the Government supplies the $500 million indemnity at a nominal insurance premium of only $30 per year per thermal megawatt of installed capacity. For a plant of 140,000 electric kilowatts of capacity, this would come to about $12,000 or $13,000 per year. This insurance alone proves the colossal danger of an atomic energy plant, particularly one close to centers of habitation."

Comment: The private insurance industry has placed a limit on the amount it will cover per project partly because of the level of coverage but also because it does not have a mass of accumulated statistical data on commercial reactor plant operation comparable to that on which it bases insurance conditions for other industrial activities. It is hoped that, with the growing accumulation of nuclear powerplant operating data, the insurance industry will not only increase its coverage but also reduce rates.

The magnitude of the Government indemnity is not an admission of the "colossal danger" of a nuclear plant. The Price-Anderson Indemnity Act was adopted in order to assure that funds would be available in order to satisfy third party liability claims which might exceed the amount of insurance required in the event of a theoretically possible, but highly unlikely, accident. It is true that there is potential of considerable damage if, in spite of all safeguards and controls, a nuclear plant should suffer a severe accident, but (as mentioned above) the Commission's requirements for safety of plant design, methods of operation and site conditions are designed to render the possibility of such an accident extremely remote. The Commission's accident record over the many years it has built and operated numerous reactors is excellent, better than that of most conventional industries.

6. "The umbilical cord between the Government and the civilian nuclear power industry must be severed and this new industry must be made to stand on its own feet in the rough competitive power battle. Under such conditions, if nuclear powerplants are needed and are feasible, they will be built, and without Government subsidy. But it is our belief, based upon a careful study of all relevant economic data, that without Government subsidy these plants would not be built nearly as rapidly and in as great numbers as they will be under the present AEC subsidy program."

Comment: We agree with Mr. Moody that without Government assistance first-of-a-kind, large-scale commercial nuclear powerplants would probably be constructed less promptly than they would be with such aid. It is because of this that we sought and obtained legislative authorization to proceed with the modified third round program. We believe that the best interests of the American people are served by a continual search for reliable and economical ways to harness energy, and that nuclear power has the potential to meet these criteria.

Although special nuclear material is presently made available to the nuclear power industry through Government lease, legislation has been recommended by the Commission for congressional consideration which would make private ownership permissible immediately, and mandatory after a transition period.

7. "We sincerely believe that it is unfair, and in contradiction of our free enterprise system, for the Government to spend the taxpayers' money—including taxes collected from coal and other fuels industries—to encourage through subsidy the construction of plants that threaten to undermine the future growth of—and perhaps eventually to destroy—coal and associated industries upon which so many people depend for a livelihood and which play such a vital role in our economy, and in addition endanger their lives and property."

Comment: In the process of preparing its Report to the President on Civilian Nuclear

Power, the Commission performed a detailed anaysis of the projected impact of nuclear power on the potential production and consumption of fossil fuels. The conclusion reached is that, "the projected growth of nuclear power will merely supplement and not supplant coal and other fossil fuels for many decades. The fossil fuel industries and particularly the coal industry can expect a period of continuously expanding production." This forecast is illustrated by the table on page 7 of appendix 5 to the report which shows a rise in energy supplied by coal from the equivalent of 416 million tons in 1960 to 3,343 million tons in the year 2000. During the same period the energy obtained from nuclear sources, expressed in equivalent tons of coal, is estimated to be 15 million in 1970, 100 million in 1980, 410 million in 1990, and 1,260 million in 2000. As a matter of interest, it should be noted that the AEC purchases very substantial quantities of coal and in fact is the coal industry's best single customer.

LETTER TO VICE CHAIRMAN HOLIFIELD

In this letter Mr. Moody again refers to AEC concentration on commercial nuclear powerplants with concurrent neglect of the development of advanced technology, and to the ample reserves of fossil fuels. Please refer to my comments, above, on these points.

Mr. Moody introduces a new argument against further Government assistance to large-scale, proven concept nuclear plants by contending that such plants can already compete with conventional fuel plants without subsidy. He quotes Mr. Louis Roddis in support of this contention. However, in his letter to Chairman PASTORE, Mr. Moody supports his position by stating, "The AEC has made clear that without massive Government subsidies for both construction and operation these plants would not be built nor would the electricity they produce come anywhere near being competitive with coal-produced electricity even with the so-called high fuel-cost areas." It is therefore not clear to us whether Mr. Moody believes that such plants would or would not be competitive. The Commission's position is that large nuclear plants built at this time could produce electricity at costs no greater than those from conventional plants in areas where the delivered cost of fossil fuel is 35 cents per million B.t.u.'s or greater.

I would like to add a final comment regarding Mr. Moddy's statement in his letter to Chairman PASTORE that the National Coal Policy Conference speaks for the industrial federation built around bituminous coal, including, "coal-consuming electric utilities." In view of the more than half a billion dollars already spent by the utility industry on nuclear powerplants, plus the commitments for several hundred million dollars more, it is obvious that at least a large segment of the utility industry believes that nuclear energy has the potential to serve as a reliable and economic alternative, supplemental source of electric power.

I trust the above comments will be of assistance to you. We would be pleased to furnish any additional information you may require.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. LUEDECKE,
General Manager.

THE PORTSMOUTH, N.H., HARBOR PROJECT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I commend the Committee on Appropriations and the diligent chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works for presenting to the Senate for its approval the first of several appropriations that will be required to complete the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River project. The committee has acted in a most farsighted manner, because the estimates for this work of harbor improvement were made final too late for their inclusion in the budget submitted by the President in January of this year.

I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the national significance of this project, which testifies to the work of our National Government in creating the basis for economic improvement in every region of our country.

THE PORTSMOUTH PROJECT DEPENDS ON CIVIC IMAGINATION

The city of Portsmouth stands today as a community confirmed in its courage to plan ahead. The proud name of the "Port City," inherited from our oceangoing forefathers, has recently become a touchstone for progress throughout the seacoast region of New Hampshire. A dozen years ago, Portsmouth Harbor handled only 863,000 short tons of ocean cargo. Rapid currents in a tortuous channel bordered with rocks have made entry into the harbor an unacceptable risk for all but the most skilled navigators. The present depth of the channel in its upper reaches prevents the use of large modern tankers, also preventing full use of the harbor. But the obstancles to be overcome in fulfilling the port city's bright future were not those of nature alone. A slumbering tradition had to be revived. Businessmen had to be convinced that the prospects for progress were commercially sound. Public interest had to be awakened. It is a tribute to the city fathers, business and civic leaders of Portsmouth and many farsighted men and women throughout New Hampshire that our State legislature created the New Hampshire State Port Authority in 1957. Our best brains turned to problems of transportation by rail and highway, coordinating harbor improvements with the needs of the military at nearby Pease Air Force Base and the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, and laying plans with interested busines firms. An enlightened local press and radio helped to build a solid public understanding of maritime commerce and the plans for the port. The story is an inspiring one, in which the public-spirited imagination of our whole seacoast region was brought to bear on the needs of the harbor and its commerce. It is now confidently planned that the port will handle almost 2 million tons annually in a few years.

CONVINCING THE CONGRESS

In 1958 and 1959 resolutions were passed in the Public Works Committees of each House of the Congress, asking the Corps of Engineers to explore the desirability of harbor improvements. The report to the chief of the Corps of Engineers was transmitted to the Congress by the Secretary of the Army on July 5, 1962. By summer of 1963, local support for the project had become virtually unanimous. Gov. John W. King drew attention to the State's plans to begin construction of a $3.8 million harbor terminal capable of handling the newest type of container ship and all but the very largest supertankers. Mr. John Rowe, State commissioner of resources and economic development, observed that recent Supreme Court decisions had cleared the way for more competitive overland freight rates to our northern ports and that the new facilities "are believed to be the first in the Nation engineered from the ground up to handle rail and truck tonnage for the new class of container ships." Mayor John J. Wholey stated his belief that the project is "essential to the present and future economic welfare of the city of Portsmouth." The diligent chairman of the New Hampshire State Port Authority, Mr. Eugene P. Soles, wrote as follows:

> The fact that larger ships must navigate the harbor and river at partial draft is obviously an economic detriment, which affects not only the ship operators, but the economy of the local area. I firmly believe that the completion of the proposed project will permit the safe and orderly passage of deeper draft vessels, and consider the project to have a vital bearing upon the economic welfare of the State of New Hampshire.

Rear Adm. C. J. Palmer, U.S. Navy, commander of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, stated that "improvements in the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River will substantially improve the facility of handling modern submarines and Navy tankers in this area." Lt. Col. John S. Robinson, U.S. Air Force, acting commander of Pease Air Force Base pointed out that harbor improvements would "permit fuel delivery by larger tankers and thereby assure an adequate backup supply and flow of aviation fuels for day-to-day operations as well as for unforeseen national emergencies." Mr. Thomas M. Prentiss, president of the Greater Portsmouth Chamber of Commerce, foresaw that the project "would assist such interests as may be desirous of locating in tidewater areas of the State as well as benefiting existing businesses." Such local businesses as the Portsmouth Navigation Corp., C. H. Sprague & Son Co., the Atlantic Terminal Sales Corp., New England Tank Industries of New Hampshire, the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, and the Simplex Wire & Cable Co., presented excellent statements of the benefit the harbor project would provide for their operations. Out-of-State firms such as the Central Maine Power Co., the National Gypsum Co., the Keystone Shipping Co., the Trinidad Corp., and the Socony Mobil Oil Co., welcomed news of the project and most said they would consider expanding their operations into and out of the Portsmouth Harbor.

Mr. President, it was my pleasure to contribute what I could to consideration of this important project in the Congress. On June 13 of this year I testified in its favor before Senator ELLENDER's subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be reprinted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTSMOUTH HARBOR AND PISCATAQUA RIVER PROJECT

(Statement of Hon. THOMAS J. MCINTYRE before the Public Works Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, June 13, 1963)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you and the members of the subcommittee for this

opportunity to discuss the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River Navigation project.

The 1962 Rivers and Harbors Act authorizen this project, for which the total estimated cost is $7½ millior.. Its principal purpose would be the widening of the tortuous channel that winds upstream through Portsmouth Harbor and to extend that channel some 1,700 feet above the Newington dock facilities.

In 1956 several ledges were removed, deepening the present channel to 35 feet, enabling tankers of some 25,000 deadweight tons to reach the Public Service Co. of New Hampshire, while the upper reaches of the river remain limited to ships of some 17,000 deadweight tons. The project would widen the channel and eliminate submerged ledges, permitting tankers of up to 35,000 deadweight tons to use the entire chennel.

Fast tidal currents, sharp bends, and difficult bridge approaches make the existing channel a hazardous one. The fact that this danger has not led to serious collisions, groundings, and perhaps even fires is a tribute to the skill of the Portsmouth Harbor pilots.

The high cost of petroleum deliveries from smaller, less efficient vessels constitutes a heavy burden upon our State, which must rely upon coastal shipping to neutralize the effect of unreasonably high rail and motor freight rates. These high costs have contributed to the fact that New Hempshire's residential electricity rates are the highest in the Nation. It has been estimated that annual savings of some $600,000 would result from the channel improvements described by the Corps of Engineers.

The project has been assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.1 to 1. The 2-mile extension to Newington and the upper turning basin have been assigned a benefit-to-cost ratio of 6.5 to 1. But in terms of the urgent hopes of the citizens of Portsmouth, I believe this project bears even more significant merit. On the Piscataqua channel the city of Portsmouth, in cooperation with the State Department of Resources and Economic Development, hopes to locate a foreign-trade zone. The University of New Hampshire hopes to develop a deep sea marine science program which would require docking facilities for oceanographic vessels. The Port Authority hopes to develop commercial fishery docking facilities that must await the widening of the channel. So this project, if it is provided, will set off a whole chain reaction of harbor improvements of definite commercial and research significance. In the final analysis, it is for this reason that I strongly urge the members of this subcommittee to approve the expenditure of the first $1½ million for the Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River project.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I am a convinced supporter of New Hampshire's booming seacoast region. The proposals for harbor improvements, new port facilities, a foreign-trade zone, and a marine science center have had my full support since I began my service in the Senate. I have joined in offering bills to provide for the development of new stern-ramp trawlers and fishing vessel construction subsidies to help expand our lagging commercial fisheries fleet. I have joined in offering legislation, which has since passed the Senate, to provide for commercial fisheries research and water resources research in our State universities. I have repeatedly stressed the importance of maintaining a strong national establishment of naval shipyards, whose readiness and skills are so essential in times of challenge. I have repeatedly urged that restrictions be lifted from trade in residual fuel oil, the only fuel available in New Hampshire at a nationally competitive price. It would be my conviction that citizens of New Hampshire's seacost region and port city should lend their support to these efforts and to local efforts to make the most of our short but historic seacoast. The recent report of the National Academy of Sciences on marine resources, as well as many studies by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission and other farsighted groups remind us that the resources of the sea are truly inexhaustible. They represent a new frontier for our port city in times of constant change and I am fully confident that our citizens will prove more than equal to the challenge.

TEAMWORK FOR PROGRESS

Mr. President, projects such as the Portsmouth Harbor project mean hard work. Hard work by a Senate subcommittee that heard literally hundreds of witnesses. Hard work by Government agencies such as the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, the Coast Guard, and many others. Hard work by local leaders and State government. Hard work by the New Hampshire State Port Authority.

It has been charged that government funds spent for public works belong to some particularly irresponsible class of public waste. I would not deny the need to obtain full value for such funds, but I wonder if the critics have any idea of the scrutiny that such projects receive. Four committees of the Congress examine them. The Corps of Engineers and all related Federal agencies examine them. The States weigh them with a critical eye. No project is authorized unless benefits outweight costs. The very best talent that the Nation enjoys helps to plan these projects and helps the Congress enact them into law. The use of public funds for public works constitutes an investment in public progress, not merely for one region or area, but for the country as a whole. Manufacturers all across the Nation will find in Portsmouth a new shipping point for their goods. The beltways of maritime commerce that encircle the Nation will be strengthened. Our foreign trade will be expanded. This is true not just because Uncle Sam lays out funds for harbor improvement, but because local groups and private citizens match these ideas with their own, and make investments which more than match the value of Federal works of improvement. Without such local cooperation, there would be little value in the Federal projects. But planning and building together, our local communities and the Federal Government can each supplement the strengths of the other and lay the foundation for enduring progress. That is what has happened in the Port City of the Granite State on this occasion and, I am confident, many more to come in the future. I ask unanimous consent that the excellent publication of the New Hampshire State Port Authority entitled "Newest World Port" be reprinted as a conclusion to my remarks.

There being no objection, the publication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWEST WORLD PORT

New Hampshire State Port Authority: Eugene P. Soles, chairman; Carl M. Lougee, vice chairman; Hugh G. Hamilton; Frank W. Fate; John F. Rowe; John E. Seybolt; Ralph T. Harris; Cap. Woodbury S. Adams, director.

AN INVITATION

State construction of modern terminal facilities at Portsmouth Harbor marks the rebirth of one of the Nation's oldest seaports.

Through the efforts and foresight of former Gov. Wesley Powell, and his executive council, this became a reality.

The port and its terminal are being developed to take advantage of the transportation industry's ever increasing growth.

New Hampshire and Portsmouth invite your consideration of the port's ability to meet your requirements, with these new facilities added to other advantages—a deep, 35-foot channel, proximity to principal ocean routes, a growing network of modern highways, adequate rail service, a stable industrial climate, plus thrifty and progressive government.

At Portsmouth, where the first naval vessel to fly the U.S. flag was launched, site of an important naval shipyard since colonial days, for many years one of the Nation's leading ports for merchant shipping, New Hampshire looks forward to renewed maritime activity and welcomes your participation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. KING,
Governor.

A NEW ERA IN NEW HAMPSHIRE COMMERCE

"Portsmouth has the important advantage of being a completely ice-free port. The major program of expansion and improvement now underway clearly indicates that Portsmouth is entering its most successful era in seaborne commerce."—EUGENE P. SOLES, chairman, New Hampshire State Port Authority.

A new world port for New England

Portsmouth, N.H., is a completely ice-free year-round port. It is also the only natural deepwater harbor between the ports of Boston and Portland. The modern port and marine terminal at Nobles Island in the Piscataqua River will save money and time—in importing raw materials and exporting finished products—for industrial firms extending outward from the Portsmouth area.

The first stage plans for the marine terminal include the construction of a concrete wharf superstructure and decking, 450 feet in length and 50 feet in width, which will accommodate oceangoing vessels. A 27,000-square-yard reception and storage area adjacent to the wharf will lead to access areas built to tie in with existing roadways.

Second stage plans call for the addition of two more berths, a much enlarged staging and storage area, and a complex of buildings for warehousing, inspection, maintenance, and administrative purposes.

A $7,500,000 Federal project to widen and deepen certain areas of the Piscataqua River is presently being undertaken by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This will facilitate navigation of even larger oceangoing ships in the river.

The growth of New Hampshire industry

Manufacturing industry in New Hampshire has grown enormously since 1940. This growth has been carefully programed by the State's department of resources and economic development, the industrial park authority, the New Hampshire Business Development Corp., and a number of regional development corporations.

The results? Today New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the Nation, despite the fact that it ranks second among all the States in the percentage of its population employed in manufacturing industries.

There is still, however, virtually unlimited room for new industry close to the area of the new port and marine terminal. Yours, for example.

New Hampshire and the world's markets

The European Common Market is gradually easing tariffs, quotas, and import duties at home and abroad. This is already increasing America's share in world trade. And so Portsmouth becomes an increasingly important link between the commerce of Europe and our northern tier of States.

The new port and marine terminal will make Portsmouth the most convenient shipping and importing point for many companies in New Hampshire, Vermont, Ohio, and northern New York. Completion of New Hampshire's modern and efficient highway system will provide a tie-in with important midwestern ports that are icebound during the winter.

Foreign trade zone potential

There is ample available land close to the new port for development of a foreign trade zone. Should any companies settling in the Portmouth area require the benefits of a foreign trading zone, the New Hampshire State Port Authority is authorized to establish such a zone under existing regulations.

THE NEW AND THE TRADITIONAL OF PORTSMOUTH HARBOR

Birthplace of the American Navy

Founded in 1623 at the mouth of the Piscataqua River, Portsmouth is one of the oldest cities in the United States. It is New Hampshire's most important seaport. "Birthplace of the American Navy," Portsmouth was a thriving port and shipbuilding center in the late 17th and early 18th centuries. Timber and other goods from inland communities were shipped down river in gundelows to Portsmouth and loaded into oceangoing vessels for shipment abroad. In 1777, the famous *Ranger* was built in Portsmouth for John Paul Jones. In 1782 the first ship of the line built in America, mounting 74 guns, was completed and presented to France by Congress in gratitude for French aid during the American Revolution.

The clipper ship era

During the War of 1812, commerce in Portsmouth all but disappeared, but shipbuilding became an important industry once more by 1840. Men of all nations went down to the sea in the famous Portsmouth clipper ships such as the *Typhoon, Chocorua* and *Witch of the Wave*. These ships gained worldwide fame as the fastest vessels afloat in the heyday of the gold, tea, and opium trade. But with the coming of steam and steel ships, Portsmouth's greatest commercial era drew to a close. Even before the arrival of the 20th century, Boston and Portland had surpassed Portsmouth as the centers of seaborne commerce in New England.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has always been an important Government installation, building warships of all types for the U.S. Navy. But commerce in the port dwindled away during the first 40 years of this century. This very lack of activity finally encouraged private industries to establish loading facilities along the south bank of the Piscataqua for the quick movement of coal and fuel oil to users throughout the State by means of the excellent highway system.

Increasing commerce

During the last two decades, this activity has grown considerably. From 1955–60 an average of 1,300,000 short tons of materials have been shipped through the privately owned facilities along the river.

The New Hampshire Port Authority, created by the legislature in 1957, advocated the establishment of a State port and marine terminal to give further stimulus to the New Hampshire economy. In 1962, Gov. Wesley Powell and his council authorized $800,000 toward the first stage of construction of the port.

Located at Nobles Island, adjacent to the Interstate Highway Bridge across the Piscataqua River to Maine, the new port has facilities for handling containerized as well as general cargo. With an authorized $7,500,000 Federal program for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to deepen and widen the river and harbor, oceangoing ships of any size may be accommodated at the new marine terminal.

A new era dawns

Thus Portsmouth, a busy seagoing community 300 years ago, looks forward to the revival of her past glory. With industry throughout the State increasing at a rapid rate, the new marine terminal will soon make the waters of the Piscataqua busier than they have been since Portsmouth clipper ships ruled the seven seas.

NEW GATEWAY TO NEW ENGLAND AND THE WEST

Year-round port service for the Midwest

Portsmouth is geographically the gateway to northern New England and to many points in the Midwest bordering the Great Lakes. With ports such as Toledo and Cleveland icebound during the winter months, Portsmouth can serve as a shipping point for goods normally sent to and from these ports in warmer weather.

New highway system

Serving the State's industry as well as industrial firms in Vermont, New Hampshire's excellent new highway system is rapidly being expanded and soon will be one of the finest in the Nation. Already it provides express connections from Portsmouth north to Portland and Canada and south to Boston, Providence, and New York City. More than 25 major trucking companies serve New Hampshire, assuring direct service to all points within the State.

Rail connections good and economical

The Boston & Maine Railroad services New Hampshire with both passenger and freight service. Freight trains leave all principal cities daily for Boston and New York. Connections with Canadian railways via the Boston & Maine Railroad afford New Hampshire shippers the advantage of cheaper differential rates to Canada west of Kingston, Ontario, and to destinations in the United States between central Ohio and the Rocky Mountains, and north of a line through the central part of Kentucky, Missouri, and Kansas.

Harbor traffic tripled since 1940

Despite the lack of a State port and terminal facilities in Portsmouth, traffic in the harbor has more than tripled since 1940. In that year, 405,553 short tons of cargo moved through the private docking facilities in the Piscataqua River. By 1955, tonnage had risen to more than 1,200,000 short tons, and from 1956 to 1960, the average yearly tonnage approximated 1,300,000 short tons.

The majority of this tonnage consisted of imports, including petroleum products of all classes, gypsum or plaster rock, bituminous coal and lignite, electrical machinery and raw salt.

NEW IMPETUS FOR NEW HAMPSHIRE'S STEADILY RISING IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE

New Hampshire exports

Total value of exports from New Hampshire in 1960 is estimated at $54.7 million. Most important exporting industries in the State are nonelectrical machinery, including special industry machinery, primary metals, textile mill products, paper and allied products, leather, and leather products, and electrical machinery. These six industries exported more than 90 percent of the estimated totals of manufactured goods from the State in 1960.

Imports to New Hampshire

The nonelectrical machinery industry, largest exporter of manufactured goods (almost 50 percent of the total exported), is also indirectly dependent on imports for its high volume of production. Large quantities of ferroalloys are produced by the primary metals industries from imported ores and concentrates of manganese, chromite, nickel, cobalt, and columbite-tantalite, and tungsten. Other indirect import requirements include nonferrous ores or metals, such as antimony, copper and tin.

The primary metals industry, textile mill products, leather and leather products, electrical machinery, and agriculture in New Hampshire are all steady importers of foreign made products.

A good percentage of these imports, as well as the finished goods in which they are used, will flow through the new State port.

TAKE A NEW HARD LOOK AT THE VITALITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE'S ECONOMIC CLIMATE

Healthy economic climate

In addition to the import-export advantages of the new Marine Terminal, the State of New Hampshire offers an economic climate second to none.

No corporate income tax

The State has no corporate income tax and no general sales tax. It depends more upon ad valorem property taxes for tax revenue than most other States. Approximately 60 percent of all taxes collected for support of State and local government come from this one source. And industry pays only 13 percent of the total property taxes.

Large female labor market

Although New Hampshire has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country, there is a substantial female labor market. Our women are industrious, adaptable, and imbued with the Yankee concept of "an honest day's work for an honest day's pay."

Loyal, intelligent workers

The New Hampshire worker is intelligent, loyal, and hard working. Wage rates throughout the State are reasonable by big city standards. Fringe benefits too are well within sensible standards.

Adequate water supply

Water supply throughout the State is more than adequate and electric power and fuel rates are reasonable. The Public Service Co. of New Hampshire services about 80 percent of all users of electric power in the State. Fuel oil, brought into Portsmouth by tanker, is naturally cheaper than anywhere else in the State. Natural gas is also available in Portsmouth, brought in by one of the two transmission pipe lines running through the State.

Excellent educational facilities

New Hampshire has top-notch public schools and colleges ranging from excellent small institutions to nationally famous centers of learning such as the University of New Hampshire and Dartmouth College.

Enjoyable living

Executives and workers alike can enjoy living in one of the Nation's finest vacationlands. Skiing, hiking, golf, swimming, boating, camping, hunting, fishing and a host of other outdoor sports can be enjoyed in the most beautiful surroundings in the eastern part of the United States.

Economic analysis available

There is a complete analysis of population and labor supply, wage rates, taxes, trans-

portation facilities, and other factors affecting New Hampshire as an industrial location. We would like to place a copy of this study in your hands to convince you that locating your plant in New Hampshire, with the added bonuses of a new port designed to your needs, is worth looking into. Just drop a line to: Director, New Hampshire State Port Authority, Post Office Box 295, Portsmouth, N.H.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 9140) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MUNDT and Mrs. SMITH conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRIBUTE TO MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE AND STAFF

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I take this occasion to thank the members of the subcommittee and the members of the Appropriations Committee for their assistance in handling the bill. I particularly wish to thank and compliment the competent clerk of the committee, Mr. Kenneth Bousquet, who sits with me here, and who is really and truly my right-hand man in the handling of this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, once again the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has shown his usual skill in handling legislative matters, whether they be from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the Committee on Appropriations. This has been a most difficult bill to deal with. It is an intricate bill. It is a bill that very few Members of the Senate understand, and understandably so. However, it is a bill which has received the constant attention of the Senator from Louisiana.

I compliment him and the ranking minority member of the committee the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the other members of the committee, and the staff for the outstanding work they have done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the majority leader in paying respects to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues on the committee. As the Senator from Montana knows, public works are of vital importance to my State and to the entire Pacific Northwest. We have never received any gratuity from the Senator from Louisiana, and we would not have deserved it if we had requested it. We always receive a fair hearing from the Senator from Louisiana in making our presentation. On behalf of the people of my State, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for the fairness and justice that he has shown us.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana goes infinitely further than merely giving a fair hearing to a Senator who comes before him on this detailed bill. He knows the problem that every Senator faces. He goes over and beyond the call of duty in cooperating with Senators in order to make certain that full justice is done.

Once more, I salute the distinguished and efficient clerk of the subcommittee. I have occasion to know how generous and kind he has been to my own office force and my staff members. I publicly thank Ken Bousquet for his cooperation and his every kindness. This has been a consistent attribute of his over a long period of time, including the years when I served on the Committee on Appropriations. So I salute him and thank him.

Likewise, I thank the minority clerk, who has been a tower of strength in this matter. We salute him, as well.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of the people of my State of Texas, I desire to thank the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana for his patient hearings. The record shows that nearly 4,500 pages of testimony were taken. I was present this year, as I have been in past years, and I know that every delegation that has appeared has been courteously treated by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. We have waited our turn in line, as have delegations from many other States. All of them, from every State, have received unfailing courtesy. That reflects credit on the Senate and all its committees. The chairman has remained in the committee day after day, and personally knows what the record contains.

Mr. Bousquet and all the other members of the staff who worked with the chairman are diligent in furnishing opportunities for witnesses to be heard. They cooperate by answering correspondence. They are knowledgeable and understand the requests of the people of my State who appear before the committee on matters on which they desire to be heard.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his efficient work.

THE SENATE AND ITS LEADERSHIP

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Wednesday, November 27, 1963, the majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, spoke in the Senate on "The Senate and Its Leadership." On page 21756 of that day in speaking of the lists which he was about to set forth, he said:

> I welcome any additions to them from other Members who may feel that I have slighted the achievements of any past Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be amended to add the following two accomplishments to the 80th Congress:

Eighth. It balanced the budget and passed an income tax reduction bill, the Revenue Act of 1948.

Ninth. It enacted the Presidential Succession Act as well as the presidential term amendment.

Also, I ask that the permanent RECORD be amended to show in the list of the 83d Congress the followings additions:

Eleventh. It created a Small Business Administration.

Twelfth. It passed the Communist Control Act of 1954 which outlawed the Communist Party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additions will be made.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is due an explanation of the procedure that will be followed this afternoon. It had been anticipated that the conference report on the Independent Offices appropriation bill would be available this afternoon. We find that this is not so. However, the House has agreed to the conference report on the foreign aid authorization bill, and that will be the business following the disposition of the military construction appropriation bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been asked by several Senators to announce what the position will be of Senators who are opposed to the conference report on the foreign aid bill. The House having agreed to the conference report this afternoon by a vote of some 190 to 164, while we cannot move to recommit but we shall move to reject the report and ask for a further conference. We intend to analyze the conference report section by section.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, H.R. 9139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this measure brings before the Senate the military construction appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1964. There are no particular innovations or far-reaching new programs provided in the bill. The program is a continuation of what might be called the regular military construction program.

There is one unusually large item of $185 million for the construction of additional ballistic missile sites. The next largest item is for military housing, which the Senate will remember is now handled by direct appropriations, rather than under the old system of what was called Capehart housing.

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 9, 1963

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commis-

sion, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Cemeterial Expenses

salaries and expenses

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; $10,800,000: *Provided,* That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further,* That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of $17,000, but such limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure:

Provided further, That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, (1)~~$18,000,000~~ *$20,600,000* to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That $210,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); (2) ~~$798,282,700~~ *$849,856,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood

control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; and emergency flood control and shore protection activities; (3)~~$150,000,000~~ *$157,368,000*, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Beach Erosion Board; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; $15,000,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by

flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), (4)~~$74,500,000~~ *$80,406,000,* to remain available until expended.

(5)*UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS*

For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: Provided, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manners authorized by section 19 (b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended

(5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and eighty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

operating expenses

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; and pay-

ments of not to exceed $50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, (6)~~$25,000,000~~ *$25,725,000*.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, of which seven are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; (7)~~$6,500,000~~ *$7,250,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters for non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding $16,500.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with

law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

No real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

Not to exceed (8)~~$9,000,000~~ *$9,285,000* of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourists vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed (9)~~sixteen~~ *twenty-one* passenger motor vehicles (10)*of which sixteen are* for replacement only, including one limousine at not to exceed (11)~~$6,300~~

$7,800 and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding $30,000: *Provided,* That the rates for individuals shall not exceed $100 per diem.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, including not to exceed $400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to remain available until expended, (12)~~$9,894,000~~ *$10,442,000,* of which (13)~~$8,621,000~~ *$8,902,000* shall be

derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Provided,* That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further,* That (14)~~$340,000~~ *$388,000* of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, (15)~~$180,190,000~~ *$187,425,000,* of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been

heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, $38,000,000, of which $31,408,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $1,645,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-

Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, (16)~~$12,217,000~~ *$12,367,000* to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197).

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, (17)~~$97,845,700~~ *$97,989,200,* of which $94,036,700 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and (18)~~$3,809,000~~ *$3,952,500* shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided,* That no part of the funds herein appropriated

shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, $10,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative

Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461–467) : *Provided,* That no part of any

appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations".

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law(19): *Provided, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath*

Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath Project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of Section 2(c) of the Act of June 17, 1944, and Sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665).

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed $225,000 may be expended from the

appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724).

The amount of $241,160 shall be available from "Refunds and returns" for transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the amount of credits accumulated as a reserve for depreciation and/or replacement of Siphon Drop powerplant, Yuma project, Arizona-California; this sum to be transferred to the Yuma County Water Users Association only after a contract providing for the custody, use, or expenditure of said money and containing terms satisfactory to the Secretary has been entered into with said association.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, (20)~~$36,000,000~~ *$36,204,000*, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, (21)~~$13,200,000~~ *$13,500,000*.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Adminis-

tration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $1,000,000.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, $1,500,000.

CONTINUING FUND

Not to exceed $4,500,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy, and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities wherever consolidation of activities will contribute

to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) : *Provided,* That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received.

SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; (22) ~~$2,308,169,~~

~~000~~ *$2,369,524,000,* and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That of such amount $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further,* That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase (not to exceed four hundred and twenty-three for replacement only, including two at not to exceed $3,000 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; (23) ~~$380,000,000~~ *$418,695,000*, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1963, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for "Operating expenses", for capital equipment not related to construction, shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1963, of the appropriation "Plant acquisition and construction" shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $30,000,000 for a special shift power reactor may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to carry out such cooperative power reactor demonstration program as may be authorized by law.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1964 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided,* That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropirations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the fiscal year 1964 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds,

upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Commission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided,* That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary

in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed $429,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed $2,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day: *Provided,* That not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for services of individuals employed at rates in excess of $50 per day.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including purchase (one for replacement only) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed one hundred and ninety for replace-

ment only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, (24)~~$46,000,000~~ *$48,284,000*, to remain available until expended.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), $38,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $117,000.

(25)*TITLE IV*

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $45,000,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for any project that has ever been rejected by the Senate or House of Representatives or by any Committee of the Congress.

TITLE ~~(26) IV~~ *V*—GENERAL PROVISIONS

DEPARTMENTS, AGENCIES, AND CORPORATIONS

SEC. ~~(27) 401~~ *501*. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances), is hereby fixed at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $1,950.

SEC. ~~(28) 402~~ *502*. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such

person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further,* That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further,* That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

SEC. (29)~~403~~ *503.* Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

SEC. (30)~~404~~ *504.* No part of any appropriation for the

current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. (31)~~405~~ *505*. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of $6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

SEC. (32)~~406~~ *506*. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise

specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided,* That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced.

SEC. ~~(33)~~ 407 *507*. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided,* That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury.

SEC. ~~(34)~~ 408 *508*. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

SEC. ~~(35)~~ 409 *509*. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for

expenditure by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964".

Passed the House of Representatives November 19, 1963.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments December 9, 1963.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

88TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 9140

AN ACT

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DECEMBER 9, 1963

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

Digest 202

13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that no business will be transacted Wed., and the session will be devoted to eulogies to former President Kennedy. p. 22934

HOUSE

14. MANPOWER. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 8720, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. As reported this bill extends the Act for 2 years until 1967, authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training, lowers the age limit to 17 for the youth training program, and authorizes for these changes $50 million for fiscal 1964 and $100 million for fiscal 1965. p. 22797

15. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 4955, to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand vocational education opportunities. As reported from conference, the bill authorizes $60,000,000 for fiscal 1964, $118,500,000 for fiscal 1965, $177,500,000 for fiscal 1966, and $225,000,000 for fiscal 1967 and each fiscal year thereafter; provides that 90 percent of annual appropriations be allotted among the States, 33 1/3 percent of this allotment for the first 4 fiscal years and 25 percent thereafter to go for vocational training of youths; makes clear the inclusion of the training of semi-skilled workers in this program; extends the National Defense Education Act for 1 year until June 30, 1965; extends Federal aid to education in Federally impacted areas for 2 years. (H. Rept. 1025). pp. 22797-22804

16. BEEF IMPORTS. Rep. Nelsen urged, and inserted an article urging, that attention be given to beef imports. pp. 22822-3

17. PUBLIC WORKS; ARA. Rep. Blatnik complimented the work of the accelerated public works and Area Redevelopment Administration's program toward ending unemployment and inserted testimony explaining these programs. pp. 22840-5

18. APPROPRIATIONS. Conferees were appointed for H. R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill, 1964. Senate conferees have already been appointed. (pp. 22785-6)

As passed by the Senate (see Digest 201), this bill includes various general provisions, applying to the Government generally, as follows: Limits the amount which may be paid for a passenger vehicle to $1,500, except for station wagons the maximum of which is $1,950. Requires Federal employees to be U.S. citizens, with certain exceptions, including aliens from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence. Provides for quarters and cost-of-living allowances in accordance with the Overseas Differentials and Allowances Act. Prohibits payments to employees whose nominations the Senate has rejected. Limits the price which may be paid for the U. S. Code to $4 per volume, and for the Lifetime Federal Digest to $4.25 per volume, and $6.50 per volume on the Modern Federal Practice Digest. In the case of certain corporations, makes appropriations available for certain purposes, such as rent in the District of Columbia. Permits foreign credits to be used only when reimbursement is made to the Treasury Department. Provides that during the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts. Prohibits the use of funds by any agency for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

19. COMMITTEES. Rep. Thornberry resigned from the Rules Committee and Rep. Shelley from the Appropriations Committee. Rep. McFall was then elected to the Appropriations Committee and Rep. Young to the Rules Committee. pp. 22795-6

20. RIVER BASINS. The conferees reported H. R. 8667, to authorize additional appropriations for the prosecution of comprehensive plans for certain river basins (H. Rept. 1019). The Senate receded from its amendment providing for buying of American goods before foreign, but the committee requested that the Army examine the application of this amendment to the projects authorized by this bill and report to Congress its recommendations thereon. pp. 22796-7

21. PERSONNEL. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6041, to include fringe benefits in computation of the wages of contractors' employees. p. 22797

22. FOREIGN AID Rep. Rosenthal inserted the address by Mr. Bell, Administrator of AID, "Foreign Aid and U. S. National Security." pp. 22817-8
Rep. Passman stated that "it is not the fault of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations that we cannot bring the foreign aid bill to the floor." p. 22828

23. EMPLOYMENT. Several Representatives affirmed their faith in President Kennedy's economic program, including elimination of unemployment, need for tax reduction and public investment in conserving resources. pp. 22834-40

24. BIRD CONSERVATION. Received a letter from Interior transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for fiscal 1963; to Agriculture Committee. p. 22850

25. MINERALS. Received a letter from Interior transmitting a proposed bill "relating to the exploration program for discovery of new minerals", to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 22850

26. FORESTRY; RECREATION. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment H. J. Res. 658, to authorize and request the President to proclaim 1964 as "See America Year" (H. Rept. 1022). p. 22850

27. WATERSHEDS. The Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit of the Agriculture Committee approved the following watershed projects: Fishing Creek, Ga.; Little Cache, Ill.; Grant-Shanghai, Kans.; and Glen Hills, Wisc. Also, it "gave provisional approval to the Briar Creek, Pa.; and Clam River, Mass., watershed projects." p. D977

28. CREDIT UNIONS. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8459, to allow Federal credit unions greater flexibility in their organization and operations (H. Rept. 1024). p. 22850

29. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Agreed to a unanimous-consent request by Rep. Cannon that it be in order Mon. to take up the foreign aid appropriation bill. p. 22815

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

30. MEAT IMPORTS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Edmondson inserting Sen. Monroney's statement before the U. S. Tariff Commission "on the dangers facing our domestic beef producers." pp. A7506-8

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 88th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 109 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1963 No. 202

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Proverbs 3: 5: *Trust in the Lord with all thine heart and lean not upon thine own understanding.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the many opportunities we daily have of bringing our human life into a more loyal obedience and closer harmony with the enduring principles of truth and righteousness.

May we strive earnestly to make a worthy contribution to the high adventure and lofty aspiration of establishing a social order in our Republic that has in it the spirit of love and good will.

Inspire us with a sincere longing to emulate and manifest those spiritual virtues of faith and courage which were the secret of the greatness and strength of the Founding Fathers.

Make us more sensitive to the guidance of Thy holy spirit as we seek to determine what kind of legislation will be most helpful in lifting our beloved country and all mankind to higher levels of blessedness and the more abundant life.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On December 5, 1963:

H.R. 3190. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, relating to devises and bequests by will;

H.R. 3191. An act to exempt life insurance companies from the act of February 3, 1913, regulating loaning of money on securities in the District of Columbia; and

H.R. 7497. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia relating to annual statements and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6808. An act for the relief of the Shelburne Harbor Ship and Marine Construction Co., Inc.; and

H.R. 6974. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Maida, his wife, Caterina Maida, and their children, Antonio, and Vittoria Maida.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5945. An act to establish a procedure for the prompt settlement, in a democratic manner, of the political status of Puerto Rico.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 9139. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. STENNIS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 776. An act to encourage the creation of original ornamental designs of useful articles by protecting the authors of such designs for a limited time against unauthorized copying;

S. 1832. An act granting the consent of Congress to a further supplemental compact or agreement between the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania concerning the Delaware River Port Authority, formerly the Delaware River Joint Commission, and for other purposes;

S. 2220. An act to encourage physicians and dentists who have received student loans under programs established pursuant to title VII of the Public Health Service Act to practice their professions in areas having a shortage of physicians and dentists; and

S.J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the Commission established to report upon the assassination of President John F. Kennedy to compel the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of evidence.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL—1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, speaking for the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9139) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. SHEPPARD, SIKES, CANNON, JONAS, and CEDERBERG.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate

and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CANNON, KIRWAN, FOGARTY, JENSEN, and PILLION.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs have permission to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PRAYER AND BIBLE READING IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, today I join many of my colleagues in introducing a resolution which will amend the Constitution of the United States to permit prayer and Bible reading in our public schools.

This Congress represents the American people. If freedom of worship guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution needs clarifying or amending, then we should do so in the form of this amendment. I greatly fear that if we do not amend the Constitution permitting freedom of religion in our schools and State institutions, this ban on prayer and Bible reading could spread to the Armed Forces of the United States with their bases throughout the world. I fear it could spread to every department of the Federal Government, State government, and local government.

I shudder to think of what will happen to our freedom of religion and freedom to worship if our State courts, State legislatures, city councils, and even Congress is not permitted to call on Almighty God in our activities and call on Him to guide us in leading our people.

If this constitutional amendment is not adopted, I can foresee the day when some atheist or Communist could remove from our coins or even the floor of this House the words "In God We Trust." I can foresee the time when a new President being sworn in is not permitted to place his hand upon the Holy Bible. I can see the day when our great songs, "America," "America the Beautiful," "God Bless America," and "The Star-Spangled Banner" could be banished from our public schools and governmental meetings.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, we should read the Bible and have prayer in our homes. We cannot delegate this privilege and responsibility solely to the church or the public school; but I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, as the father of five children, four of whom are in the public schools, children whom I do not see many hours of each week, that they should have the freedom, if they so desire, to listen to the reading of the Bible and hear a word of prayer asking God's guidance in their educational endeavors.

Our teachers are dedicated to the American way of life. They know that the Founding Fathers of this country never intended for prayer and Bible reading to be banished from our schools. I have never visited a public school as a speaker without having the Bible read and prayer offered. This is a basic, fundamental, and necessary freedom. It must be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment will be adopted by this Congress and States so our religious freedom can be guaranteed to all generations to come.

PROVIDING SOLUTION TO PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY

(Mr. WYMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the renewed attention of my colleagues the provisions of H.R. 1164, introduced by me on January 9, 1963, providing a solution to the difficult problems of presidential inability. This proposal would provide a statutory solution that would put on the country's lawbooks an answer that would chart our course should an emergency arise. It would govern until and throughout the long waiting period for a constitutional amendment resolving the dispute among lawyers as to whether an amendment is or is not needed to permit Congress to legislate in this matter.

While many prominent attorneys sincerely differ as to the need for such a constitutional amendment, it is little short of a national scandal that Congress has not enacted both such a statutory solution as that set forth in H.R. 1164 and also proposed the constitutional amendment to resolve any uncertainties.

Our present President in years past has suffered at least one heart attack. Other Presidents, including President Eisenhower, have also had periods of temporary inability. Our Government should not face the danger of paralysis for lack of enabling directives from the Congress.

Executive agreements between a President and Vice President are not a satisfactory answer. Neither is a statute that does not include the means for reliably and quickly issuing a directive to a person in the position of Vice President to assume the powers and duties of the office of President during a presidential inability as well as the means for declaring termination of an inability.

This bill, H.R. 1164, was unanimously endorsed by the American Bar Association's house of delegates in February of 1962. It should be enacted without further delay.

KNOWLES DAM PROJECT, MONTANA

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the House may have an opportunity tomorrow or Thursday to assist President Johnson in his new drive for economy in Government, and to redeem our pledges for economy that were made during the debate on the tax reduction bill, by sustaining the Committee on Public Works in its steadfast refusal to authorize construction of the Knowles Dam project in Montana.

Mr. Speaker, this is a $257 million project at the very least, and testimony was given that the legitimate claims of the Salish Indians, whose tribal lands would be taken in violation of treaty, and the added costs of relocating the transcontinental railroad in the area will add another $100 million to the final bill.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the State of Montana, through five of its Governors, including the incumbent, opposed this project as unneeded and wasteful.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, we will have an unusual opportunity to save the taxpayers a tremendous sum of money, to uphold the intentions of the new President, and to redeem our own pledges if we vote against the authorization of the Knowles Dam project and support our colleagues on the Public Works Committee.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on October 24, 28, and 29 I addressed the House. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected in the following instances, all typographical errors.

October 24, page 19258, column 3, test: "Aspects of Personality," lines 11 and 15, should read "Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc."

October 24, page 19259, column 3, line 1, sixth word is "tool" instead of "look."

October 24, page 19259, column 2, lines 5 and 9 should read "Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc."

October 24, page 19259, column 2, test: Billett-Starr—lines 3 and 10 should read "Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc."

October 28, page 19369, column 1, test: "Children's Personality Questionnaire," paragraph 5, line 1, seventh word, should be "is" instead of "if."

October 28, page 19370, column 1, line 4, first word should read "intrafamily" instead of "infrafamily."

October 28, page 19370, column 1, test: "Gordon Personal Profile and Inventory," lines 4 and 8 should read "Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc."

October 28, page 19370, column 2, test: "Heston Personal Adjustment Inventory," lines 6 and 11 should read "Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc."

October 28, page 19371, column 2, test: "House-Tree-Person," lines 16 and 17 should read: "Used with subjects 3 years and older. Norms available for subjects 15 years and older." Rather than: "Used with subjects 15 years and older."

October 28, page 19372, column 1, test: "IPAT Eight-Parallel-Form Anxiety Battery," line 24, fifth word should be "repeated" instead of "repeat," also on lines 29 and 30 it should read "combined" instead of "obtained."

October 28, page 19372, column 1, test: "IPAT Humor Test of Personality," line 19, seventh word should read "deceptions" instead of "defections."

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Dec. 12, 1963
For actions of Dec. 11, 1963
88th-1st, No. 203

CONTENTS

Agricultural appropriations....3
Air pollution....13
Appropriations....1,3,5,11
Cotton....14
Foreign aid....5,12
Foreign trade....9,10
National park....15
National Service Corps....2
Public works....1,6
Reclamation....8
Research....16
Taxation....9
Tobacco....9
Watersheds....7
Wheat....4
Wildlife....8

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on public works appropriation bill House subcommittee voted to report National Service Corps bill. Rep. Hoeven stated Johnson administration wants new wheat legislation. Rep. Cramer criticized public works acceleration program. Rep. Alger criticized Cooley cotton bill.

HOUSE

1. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 9140 (H. Rept. 1027)(pp. 23034-44). As reported from conference, the bill includes $30,000,000 (instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate) for the public works acceleration program, of which $2,000,000 is for the administration of the going program. The report states that the conferees agreed that the use of funds appropriated for this program, except for the $2,000,000 for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects. This bill also includes general provisions applicable to the Government generally (see Digest 202 for a summary of these provisions).

2. NATIONAL SERVICE CORPS. The Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Education and Labor Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 5625, to provide for the establishment of a National Service Corps to strengthen community service programs in the U.S. p. D982

3. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964. The "Daily Digest" states that conferees met on this bill, H. R. 6754, but did not reach final agreement, and recessed subject to call. p. D983

4. WHEAT. Rep. Hoeven stated that the Johnson administration "wants new wheat legislation enacted into law before the 1964 election," and inserted a Wall Street Journal article stating that the administration "plans to submit a wheat control bill to Congress early next week based on voluntary, instead of forced, participation by farmers." p. 23051

5. FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964. Rep. Conte objected to a request by Rep. Passman that the Appropriations Committee have until midnight Sat., Dec. 14, to file a report on this bill. pp. 23033-4

6. PUBLIC WORKS. Rep. Cramer criticized the public works acceleration program, stated that "continuation of this program is not in the best public interest," and inserted a listing of accelerated public works projects. pp. 23051-5

7. WATERSHEDS. The Subcommittee on Conservation and Credit of the Agriculture Committee approved the following watershed projects: Little Shenango River, Pa. (amended); Marsh Creek, Pa. (amended); Briar Creek, Pa. (amended); Broad Brook, Mass.; Bradley Brook, Mass.; and Clam River, Mass. p. D982

8. WILDLIFE. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment S. 793, to promote the conservation of the Nation's wildlife resources on the Pacific flyway in Ore. and Calif. and to aid in the administration of the Klamath reclamation project. p. D982

9. THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment H. R. 8975, to provide for the tariff classification of certain particleboard; without amendment H. R. 8461, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the manufacture in bonded manufacturing warehouses of cigars made of tobacco imported from more than one foreign country; with amendment H. R. 7267, to authorize partial refunds of gasoline taxes directly to aerial applicators with respect to gasoline used by them in providing services to farmers in farming operations. p. D983

10. FOREIGN TRADE. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees agreed to file a report on H. R. 2513, to amend provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 which requires containers of imported articles to be marked to indicate country of origin so as to provide that when articles are repackaged in the U.S. and offered for sale the new packages must be marked to show the country of origin of the contents. As agreed to by the conferees, "the House would accept the Senate amendment thereto, having an effective date of Mar. 31, 1964, instead of June 1963." p. D983

SENATE

11. APPROPRIATIONS. Began consideration of H. R. 7063, the State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary and related agencies appropriation bill, 1964. p. 23031

12. FOREIGN AID At the request of Sen. Mansfield, rescinded a unanimous-consent agreement providing for a vote Thurs. on the conference report on H. R. 7885, the foreign aid authorization bill. pp. 23031-3

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

13. AIR POLLUTION. A speech by Rep. Burkhalter complimenting Los Angeles on their efforts to solve the smog problem and mentioning the crop damage caused by air pollution in that county. pp. A7549-50

88TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
1st Session } { No. 1027

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

DECEMBER 11, 1963.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CANNON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 9140]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 9, 10, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$19,115,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$827,146,500*; and the Senate agree to the same.

99-006—63——1

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$154,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$77,862,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$10,294,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$185,431,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$2,342,669,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$400,000,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert *$47,142,000*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

TITLE IV

Funds Appropriated to the President

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $30,000,000.

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5 and 19.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN
(I reserve on No. 25),
JOHN R. PILLION,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
PAT MCNAMARA,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Corps of Engineers—Civil

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $19,115,000 instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	Conference allowance
General Investigations		
1. Surveys:		
(a) Navigation studies	$1,535,000	$2,164,000
(b) Flood control studies	4,440,000	5,351,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	350,000	400,000
(d) Comprehensive basin studies:		
Big Black River, Miss	25,000	25,000
Big Muddy River, Ill	115,000	115,000
Brazos River Basin, Tex	200,000	200,000
Colorado River, Tex	215,000	215,000
Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H	250,000	250,000
Fox River, Wis	75,000	75,000
Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa	150,000	150,000
Grand River Basin, Mich	200,000	200,000
Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C	150,000	150,000
Missouri River Basin	250,000	250,000
Neches River, Tex	110,000	110,000
Ohio River Basin review	775,000	775,000
Pascagoula River Basin, Miss	150,000	150,000
Pearl River Basin, Miss	100,000	100,000
Puget Sound area, Washington	150,000	150,000
Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex	250,000	250,000
Sabine River, Tex	115,000	115,000
St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo	25,000	25,000
St. Johns River Basin, Maine	85,000	85,000
St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind	100,000	100,000
Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md	330,000	330,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	325,000	325,000
Wabash River, Ind. and Ill	250,000	250,000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	250,000	250,000
Willamette River Basin, Oreg	350,000	350,000

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	Conference allowance
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued		
1. Surveys—Continued		
(e) Special Studies:		
Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas	$50,000	$50,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louiriana	50,000	125,000
Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.)	300,000	300,000
Great Lakes water levels	40,000	40,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y	200,000	250,000
Hurricane studies	387,000	387,000
Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J	150,000	150,000
Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y	200,000	250,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska	197,000	197,000
San Francisco Bay area survey, California	90,000	90,000
Texas coast	250,000	250,000
Hudson River siltation study		55,000
General reduction applied against basin surveys		−1,500,000
Subtotal surveys	13,234,000	13,554,000
2. Collection and study of basic data:		
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	280,000	280,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	480,000	480,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	210,000	210,000
International water studies	85,000	85,000
Flood plain studies	715,000	715,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	1,770,000	1,770,000
3. Research and development:		
Beach erosion development studies	820,000	820,000
Hydrologic studies	185,000	185,000
Engineering studies	1,365,000	1,365,000
Plan formulation and evaluation studies	100,000	100,000
Mississippi Basin model:		
(1) Construction	461,000	461,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	210,000	210,000
Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	1,915,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, research and development	5,056,000	4,341,000
General reduction due to slippage		−550,000
Total, general investigations	20,060,000	19,115,000

Flood control studies.—The amount provided includes $25,000 for the Skunk and Squaw Creeks, Iowa, survey.

CONSTRUCTION GENERAL

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $827,146,500 instead of $798,282,700 as proposed by the House and $849,856,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Holt lock and dam	$7,700,000		$7,700,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam		$250,000		$250,000
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Paint Rock River	231,000		231,000	
(MP)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (National wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia)	500,000		500,000	
	West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)				
	Alaska:				
(N)	Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin			921,000	
(MP)	Snettishan power project		225,000		225,000
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Tucson diversion channel	1,750,000		1,750,000	
	Arkansas:				
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	10,300,000		10,300,000	
(MP)	Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri	567,000		567,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC)	De Queen Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(MP)	Degray Reservoir	2,350,000		2,350,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Garland City			250,000	
(FC)	Gillam Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	2,917,000		2,917,000	
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension			200,000	
(FC)	McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas				44,000
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	15,600,000		15,600,000	
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of third power unit	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Ozark lock and dam		285,000		285,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts				37,500
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir				125,000
(FC)	Camanche Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek				20,000

(R)	Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor				95,000
(FC)	Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement		150,000		200,000
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	610,000		610,000	
(N)	Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor	1,350,000		1,350,000	
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Mormon Slough				50,000
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000	
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	8,000,000		4,555,000	
(N)	Redondo Beach King Harbor	950,000		950,000	
(N)	Redwood City Harbor			660,000	
(FC)	Rodwood Creek		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	335,000		335,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,500,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project	900,000		840,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant)	†100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Tabchevah Creek			200,000	
(BE)	Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)	122,000		122,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	100,000		300,000	
(FC)	West Fork Reservoir		80,000		80,000
	Colorado:				
FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		86,000		86,000
	Connecticut:				
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(R)	Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments)		60,000		60,000
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir	685,000		685,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	New London Barrier				50,000
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir	900,000		900,000	
(BE)	Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement)	32,000		32,000	
(FC)	Stamford	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir		90,000		90,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	1,700,000		1,700,000	
	Delaware:				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes)	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	831,000		831,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	11,000,000		11,000,000	

	Construetiou, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiseal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Florida:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	$500,000		$500,000	
(N)	Bakers Haulover Inlet	204,000		250,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	14,000,000		14,750,000	
(N)	Cross-Florida barge canal	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Intercoastal Waterway:				
	(*a*) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	950,000		1,200,000	
	(*b*) Jacksonville to Miami	2,085,000		2,085,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	9,000		9,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor			250,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	575,000		575,000	
	Georgia:				
	Aquatic plant eoutrol. (Sec Louisiana.)				
(MP)	Carters Dam	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C			270,000	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (Sec Alabama.)				
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga		$350,000		$350,000
	Hawaii:				
(N)	Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000
(R)	Kahului Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Kaunakakai Harbor				100,000
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	766,000		766,000	
	Idaho:				
(FC)	Boise Valley	409,000		409,000	
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir		375,000		375,000
	Illinois:				
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:				
	(*a*) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 aet)	500,000		500,000	
	(*b*) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	5,700,000		5,700,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Chicago Harbor—1962 Act				27,000
(FC)	Clear Lake Speeial Drainage District		51,000		51,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Freeport		100,000		100,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modifieation, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	6,100,000		6,100,000	

(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District		100,000		100,000
	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)				
(N)	Kaskaskia River		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred)		10,000		10,000
(FC)	McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District		80,000		80,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(*a*) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	(*b*) Chain of Rocks	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Mount Carmel	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir		501,000		501,000
(FC)	Richland Creek		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee			150,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown)	695,000		695,000	
(FC)	Sny Island Levee Drainage District		166,000		166,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Tri-Pond levee			300,000	
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	9,871,000		9,871,000	
(FC)	Evansville	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois				50,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	825,000		825,000	
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee	650,000		650,000	
	McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky).				
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	3,520,000		3,520,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000
	Iowa:				
	Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)				
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge			150,000	
(FC)	Dubuque				35,000
(FC)	Floyd River and tributaries	3,800,000		3,722,000	
(FC)	Indian Creek Dam		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Little Sioux River	1,148,000		1,148,000	
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
	(*a*) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	6,000,000		6,000,000	
	(*b*) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,700,000		2,700,000	
	(*c*) Kansas City to the mouth	2,700,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Museatine Island Levee District and Museatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir			400,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	11,200,000		11,200,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir			400,000	

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Kansas:				
(FC)	Atchison		$100,000		$100,000
(FC)	Big Hill Reservoir				35,000
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Council Grove Reservoir	$1,800,000		$1,800,000	
(FC)	Dodge City		185,000		185,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(FC)	John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	580,000		580,000	
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Merriam				50,000
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	14,925,000		14,925,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Osawatomie		39,000		39,000
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Pomona Reservoir	1,887,000		1,887,000	
(FC)	Topeka	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	6,600,000		6,600,000	
	Kentucky:				
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	27,000,000		27,000,000	
(FC)	Barren River Reservoir	7,067,000		7,067,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(N)	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,200,000		9,200,000	
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir		320,000		250,000
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir		220,000		220,000
(MP)	Celina Dam (deferred)		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Corbin	270,000		270,000	
(FC)	Cumberland		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Eagle Creek Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	4,220,000		4,220,000	
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Red River Reservoir		50,000		50,000
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
	Louisiana:				
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	4,200,000		4,200,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier		103,000	47,000	103,000

(FC)	Campti Clarence levee		23,000	100,000	23,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	100,000		100,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Twelve Mile Bayou			[1] (258,000)	
	Maine:				
(N)	Narraguagus River			500,000	
(N)	Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	2,000,000		1,500,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)				
(N)	Searsport Harbor (1962 act)	718,000		718,000	
	Maryland:				
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va		100,000		100,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal) part II. (See Delaware.)				
	Massachusetts:				
(N)	Boston Harbor, Chelsea River				40,000
(R)	Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Chicopee Falls	1,385,000		1,385,000	
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservoir	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Gloucester Harbor			500,000	
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet barrier	3,634,000		3,634,000	
(N)	Plymouth Harbor (1962 act)				35,000
(BE)	Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000	
(FC)	Three Rivers	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Wareham-Marion		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Westfield		100,000		100,000
	Michigan:				
(R)	Charlevoix Harbor (pier and revetments)		30,000		30,000
(N)	Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	1,485,000		1,485,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor			200,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000		800,000	
(R)	Ludington Harbor (north revetment)	150,000		150,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	300,000		300,000	
(R)	Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.)				
(N)	Muskegon Harbor		18,000	100,000	
(R)	Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Rouge River		200,000		200,000
(N)	St. Marys River: New Poe lock	242,000		500,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	600,000		600,000	
	Minnesota:				
(N)	Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:				
	(*a*) Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	(*b*) Outer harbor, 32-foot to 27-foot channels	1,162,000		1,162,000	
(FC)	Marshall, Redwood River	696,000		696,000	
(R)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Winona	200,000		200,000	

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Mississippi:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson	$1,300,000		$1,300,000	
(FC)	Natchez			115,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir		$100,000		$100,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)				
	Missouri:				
	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Canton	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo			400,000	
(FC)	Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Hannibal		150,000		150,000
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir		300,000		350,000
	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)				
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		650,000		650,000
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
	Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	330,000		330,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
	Montana:				
(MP)	Libby Reservoir		1,000,000		1,000,000
	Nebraska:				
(FC)	Clarkson			[1] (205,000)	
(FC)	Gering Valley	650,000		650,000	
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek		80,000		80,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Norfolk		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	4,200,000		4,200,000	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev				100,000
	New Hampshire:				
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H			1,000,000	

	New Jersey:				
(R)	Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(R)	Manasquan River (bulkheads)	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel			400,000	
(R)	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	690,000		690,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., and N.J.		250,000		250,000
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act)		130,000		130,000
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir		308,000		308,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir		220,000		220,000
(FC)	Las Cruces		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Socorro	1,235,000		1,235,000	
	New York:				
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:				
	(a) Outer Harbor (1962 modification)			250,000	
	(b) South Entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels	707,000		707,000	
(N)	Buttermilk Channel	700,000		700,000	
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet, Long Island	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(N)	Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act)	917,000		917,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	380,000		380,000	
(FC)	Herkimer	286,000		286,000	
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet			300,000	
(FC)	Lackawanna	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River		100,000		100,000
(R)	Little Sodus Bay (piers)		20,000		20,000
	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Oswego Harbor (1962 act)				60,000
(N)	Rochester Harbor	1,025,000		1,025,000	
(FC)	Rosendale				100,000
(FC)	Salamanca				20,000
(FC)	South Amsterdam	700,000		700,000	
	North Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection		80,000		80,000
(BE)	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach			54,000	
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir				180,000
(FC)	Swift Creek			250,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)				135,000
	North Dakota:				
(FC)	Bowman Haley Reservoir			300,000	
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.			300,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Ohio:				
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor, 27-30-foot channels, deepen turning area	$383,000		$383,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	7,000,000		12,000,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir		$266,000		$266,000
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Caesar Creek Reservoir				75,000
	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
(N)	Cleveland Harbor:				
	(a) Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	900,000		900,000	
	(b) Deepen East Basin to 27-28 feet (1952 act)				27,000
(R)	Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Conneaut Harbor			225,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir		216,000		216,000
(FC)	East Fork Reservoir				75,000
(FC)	Fremont		100,000		100,000
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		250,000		250,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	Manchester (deferred)				8,000
(FC)	North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor	1,531,000		1,531,000	
(R)	Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	370,000		370,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Toledo Harbor	6,268,000		6,268,000	
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	3,700,000		3,700,000	
(N)	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia				150,000
(FC)	Youngstown, Crab Creek		50,000		50,000
	Oklahoma:				
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Bixby Reservoir		125,000		125,000
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Copan Reservoir				100,000
(MP)	Eufaula Reservoir	18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC)	Hugo Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	15,500,000		15,500,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	1,500,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir		40,000		40,000
(N)	Webbers Falls lock and dam		370,000		370,000

	Oregon:				
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		170,000		170,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
(MP)	Cougar Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	3,740,000		3,740,000	
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	11,650,000		11,650,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	57,000,000		57,000,000	
(MP)	Lost Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin, channel improvement and major drainage: Shelton Ditch				10,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Pennsylvania:				
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	21,227,000		21,227,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir		240,000		240,000
(FC)	Bethlehem	370,000		370,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir		428,000		428,000
(FC)	Butler	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Elkland	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Latrobe		117,000		117,000
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Raystown Reservoir				150,000
(FC)	Scranton		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa	10,800,000		10,800,000	
	Toeks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Turtle Creek	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir		150,000		150,000
	Puerto Rico:				
(N)	San Juan Harbor	4,633,000		4,633,000	
	Rhode Island:				
(FC)	Fox Point Barrier	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	1,450,000		1,450,000	
(FC)	Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier				50,000
(R)	Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters)	470,000		470,000	
(FC)	Point Judith—Hurricane barrier				50,000
	South Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
	South Dakota:				
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	3,800,000		23,800,000	
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000	
	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See North Dakota.)				
MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	5,700,000		5,700,000	

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Tennessee:				
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam	$2,400,000		$4,800,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	3,700,000		4,800,000	
(BA)	Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn	500,000		500,000	
	Texas:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	Big Fossil Creek	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act)	†800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	3,682,000		3,682,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension		$132,000		$132,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity		60,000		60,000
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios				30,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(R)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes	562,000		562,000	
(N)	Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir				50,000
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		150,000		150,000
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	Pat Mayse Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(R)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway:				
	(a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo		300,000		300,000
	(b) Rectification and widening (1954 act)	2,138,000		2,138,000	
(MP)	San Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	12,450,000		12,450,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	8,100,000		8,100,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FC)	Texas City	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	Texas City channel (dikes)	835,000		835,000	
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir		200,000		200,000

	Vermont:				
(R)	Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	555,000		555,000	
(FC)	Victory Reservoir (deferred)		65,000		65,000
	Virginia:				
(R)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.)	620,000		620,000	
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Norfolk	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000	
	Washington:				
(FC)	Colfax	600,000		600,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		39,000		39,000
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam		884,000		884,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	23,000,000		23,000,000	
(N)	Port Townsend	598,000		598,000	
(FC)	Pullman		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Sammamish River	729,000		729,000	
(N)	Swinomish Slough			150,000	
(N)	Tacoma Harbor			150,000	
(FC)	Washougal area			100,000	
	West Virginia:				
(FC)	Barboursville			[1] (150,000)	
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
(FC)	Buckhannon		73,000		73,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir		280,000		280,000
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Justice Reservoir		300,000		300,000
	Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	5,058,000		5,058,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	10,900,000		10,900,000	
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Wisconsin:				
	Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)				50,000
(N)	Kenosha Harbor			200,000	
(R)	Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Kickapoo River				50,000
(R)	Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis.	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Milwaukee Harbor		40,000		40,000
(R)	Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	600,000		600,000	
(R)	Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier)	188,000		188,000	
(R)	Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal	400,000		400,000	

[1] Eligible forselection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Wyoming:				
(FC)	Jackson Hole	$479,000		$479,000	
	Miscellaneous:				
(FC)	Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation	4,000,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing			750,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(BE)	Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000	50,000		50,000	
	Projects deferred for restudy		($150,000)	(158,000)	
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Small authorized projects	2,128,000		2,750,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Employees compensation	72,000		72,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−65,000,000		−75,000,000	
	General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities			−3,000,000	
	Grand total, construction, general	800,471,000 (819,486,000)	19,015,000	805,656,000 (827,146,500)	$21,490,500

Central and southern Florida.—The increase above the House figure includes $500,000 for beginning construction on Canal C–111, and the Cutler drain.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $154,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $157,368,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $77,862,000 instead of $74,500,000 as proposed by the House and $80,406,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:				
(*a*) Examinations and surveys	$25,000		$25,000	
(*b*) Collection and study of basic data	85,000		85,000	
Subtotal, general investigations	110,000		110,000	
2. Construction and planning:				
Mississippi River levees	2,580,000		2,700,000	
Channel improvement	26,500,000		27,250,000	
Memphis Harbor	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Old River control	1,225,000		1,225,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower White River	850,000		850,000	
Cache River	50,000		50,000	
West Tennessee tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	395,000		395,000	
Lower Arkansas	400,000		400,000	
Tensas Basin:				
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Yazoo Basin:				
Sardis Reservoir	58,000		58,000	
Enid Reservoir	56,000		56,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	49,000		49,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Main stem	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Yazoo backwater	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries	50,000		50,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	7,000,000		7,500,000	
Lake Pontchartrain			182,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	54,250,000		55,752,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,500,000		−1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning	52,750,000		54,252,000	
3. Maintenance	22,000,000		23,500,000	
Grand total	74,860,000		77,862,000	

United States Section, St. Lawrence River

JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $25,725,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $6,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

Amendment No. 8: Limits funds for administrative expenses to $9,285,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Provide for the purchase of 16 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of 21 passenger motor vehicles of which 16 are for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Limits the cost of one limousine to $7,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,300 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $10,294,000 instead of $9,894,000 as proposed by the House and $10,442,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided above the House figure include all of the specific items set forth in the Senate report, including $200,000 for comprehensive basin surveys.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that $8,902,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,621,000 as proposed by the House shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

Amendment No. 14: Provides $340,000 as proposed by the House instead of $388,000 as proposed by the Senate for transfer to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $185,431,000 instead of $180,190,000 as proposed by the House and $187,425,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
Arizona:				
Colorado River front work and levee system	$4,350,000		$4,550,000	
Gila project	2,855,000		2,855,000	
Parker-Davis project	973,000		973,000	
California:				
Central Valley project	50,445,000		48,295,000	
Colorado River front work and levee system. (See Arizona.)				
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, initial phase. (See Nevada.)				
Colorado:				
Denver office computer	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Trinidad project		$7,000		$7,000
Idaho: Mann Creek project		150,000		150,000
Kansas: Wichita project, Cheney division	3,800,000		3,800,000	
Nevada:				
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, initial phase		110,000		110,000
New Mexico: Rio Grande project, recreational facilities	460,000		300,000	
Oklahoma:				
Arbuckle project	1,800,000		1,800,000	
Norman project	7,400,000		7,400,000	
Oregon:				
Baker project, upper division		200,000		200,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir	300,000		300,000	
The Dalles project, Western division	3,150,000		3,150,000	
Vale project, Bully Creek extension	642,000		642,000	
Texas:				
Canadian River project	23,000,000		23,000,000	
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, La Feria division	1,500,000		1,500,000	
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, Mercedes division	1,400,000		1,400,000	
Utah: Weber Basin project	11,309,000		11,309,000	
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division	1,325,000		1,325,000	
Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket unit		225,000		225,000
Columbia Basin project	3,900,000		4,650,000	
Spokane Valley project	600,000		600,000	
Various:				
Drainage and minor construction program	2,432,000		2,432,000	
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,943,000		3,943,000	
Reclamation office building			350,000	
Subtotal, exclusive of Missouri River Basin project	128,484,000	692,000	127,474,000	692,000

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT				
Colorado:				
Narrows unit, South Platte division		$139,000		$139,000
North Republic unit. (See Nebraska.)				
Kansas:				
Almena unit	$5,580,000		$3,983,000	
Glen Elder unit	5,000,000		5,000,000	
Kanopolis unit, Smoky Hill division		10,000		
Wilson unit, Smoky Hill division		129,000		129,000
Montana:				
Chestnut Valley unit, Helena-Great Falls division		3,000		3,000
Cracker Box, Marsh, and Stipek units, Yellowstone division		54,000		54,000
East Bench unit	4,400,000		4,400,000	
Jefferson and Whitehall units, Three Forks division		97,700		97,700
West Branch unit, Three Forks division		27,000		27,000
Yellowtail unit	19,000,000		19,000,000	
Nebraska:				
Ainsworth unit	8,100,000		8,100,000	
Cedar Rapids division		195,000		195,000
Farwell unit	5,000,000		5,000,000	
Frenchman Cambridge division	1,787,000		1,787,000	
North Republican unit, upper Republican division		84,000		84,000
North Dakota: Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division		54,000		54,000
South Dakota:				
Crazy Horse, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, South Dakota pumping division		5,300		5,300
Garrison diversion unit. (See North Dakota.)				
Joe Creek, Culdesac, and Rousseau units, South Dakota pumping division		92,000		92,000
Oahe unit, James division		253,000		186,500
Oahe unit, James section	365,000		365,000	
Wyoming:				
Kaycee unit, Powder division		200,000		133,500
Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.)				
Various:				
Transmission division	23,956,000		23,275,000	
Drainage and minor construction program	2,258,000		2,258,000	
Subtotal, construction and advance planning (MRB)	75,446,000	1,343,000	73,168,000	1,200,000
Investigations	1,824,000		1,717,000	
Other Department agencies	3,322,300		3,180,000	
Total, Missouri River Basin project	80,592,300	1,343,000	78,065,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	211,111,300		207,431,000	
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−15,351,000		−22,000,000	
Total, construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000		185,431,000	

Central Valley project.—The conferees are in agreement that none of the available funds shall be used for reimbursement to the Westlands Water District for preconstruction work in connection with the proposed water distribution system since there is no authority in law for such reimbursement. They are also in agreement that funds budgeted for the Trinity River division should be used to initiate construction on both the Cow Creek unit and the Clear Creek South unit.

Reclamation office building.—The conferees are in agreement that a new building is needed for the Bureau of Reclamation at the Denver Federal Center, and have provided $350,000 for preconstruction planning and design. However, the construction funds for such a building should be budgeted under the General Services Administration.

LOAN PROGRAM

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $12,367,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,217,000 as proposed by the House.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $97,989,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $97,845,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Provides that $3,952,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,809,000 as proposed by the House shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
Colorado River storage project:				
Arizona: Glen Canyon unit	$25,360,000	----------	$25,360,000	----------
Colorado: Curecanti unit	18,822,000	----------	18,822,000	----------
Utah:				
Glen Canyon unit. (See Arizona.)				
Flaming Gorge unit	4,639,381	----------	4,639,381	----------
Wyoming: Flaming Gorge unit. (See Utah.)				
Transmission division	37,670,000	----------	36,000,000	----------
Participating projects:				
Colorado:				
Florida project	2,255,000	----------	2,255,000	----------
San Juan-Chama project	1,600,000	----------	1,600,000	----------
Silt project	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
New Mexico: San Juan-Chama project. (See Colorado.)				
Utah:				
Central Utah project, initial phase	----------	$1,721,300	----------	$1,400,000
Emery County project	3,853,000	----------	3,853,000	----------
Lyman project. (See Wyoming.)				
Wyoming:				
Lyman project	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
Seedskadee project	6,000,000	----------	6,000,000	----------
Drainage and minor construction program	64,619	----------	64,619	----------
Quality of water studies	----------	73,700	----------	73,700
Subtotal	101,364,000	1,795,000	99,694,000	1,473,700
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−6,181,000		−7,131,000	
Total Upper Colorado River Basin fund	96,978,000		94,036,700	
Recreational and fish and wildlife facilities:				
National Park Service	3,000,000		2,795,000	
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	1,309,000		1,157,500	
Total, recreational and fish and wildlife	4,309,000		3,952,500	
Total, Upper Colorado River storage project	101,287,000		97,989,200	

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Bonneville Power Administration

CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $36,204,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers on the part of the House concur in the Senate report language concerning Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnections.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $13,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Southwestern Power Administration

CONTINUING FUND

The conferees direct that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration, nor shall the Southwestern Power Administration promote the construction of steam generating facilities or associated transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,342,669,000 instead of $2,308,169,000 as proposed by the House and $2,369,524,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are distributed as follows:

Item	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Conference allowance
Raw materials	$324,843,000	$320,000,000
Special nuclear materials	480,471,000	475,000,000
Weapons	782,969,000	782,969,000
Reactor development	530,548,000	508,500,000
Physical research	219,077,000	197,137,000
Biology and medicine	76,973,000	71,645,000
Training, education and information	17,194,000	15,850,000
Isotopes development program	9,260,000	8,360,000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	15,100,000	13,500,000
Community program	10,081,000	10,081,000
Program direction and administration	73,415,000	72,560,000
Security investigation program	6,950,000	6,950,000
Cost of work for others	6,240,000	6,240,000
Change in selected resources	53,252,000	36,750,000
Resources received from other sources	−32,000,000	−32,000,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	−150,873,000	−150,873,000
Unobligated balance carried forward and miscellaneous adjustments		
Transfer in 1964 estimates		
Total	2,423,500,000	2,342,669,000

Reactor development.—The increase above the House figure includes $3,000,000 for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. The conferees agree that none of these funds are to be used for arrangements involving light water reactors of already proven types. The increase also includes $3,500,000 for the "seed and blanket" reactor concept.

Physical research.—The increase above the House figure includes $1,000,000 for the controlled thermonuclear research program.

Change in selected resources.—The increase above the House figure includes $6,000,000 for the civilian nuclear power cooperative program.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $400,000,000 instead of $380,000,000 as proposed by the House and $418,695,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase above the House figure includes $17,945,000 for 12 weapons construction projects approved by supplemental authorization in connection with safeguards under the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, and $750,000 for a community building at Los Alamos, N. Mex. It is expected that normal replacement and maintenance will be carried on at the Puerto Rico Training Center.

Tennessee Valley Authority

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $47,142,000 instead of $46,000,000 as proposed by the House and $48,284,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Public Works Acceleration

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $30,000,000 instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the amount provided $2,000,000 is for the administration of the going program for which $850,000,000 has already been appropriated.

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated, except for the $2,000,000 for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 26 through 35. Change title and section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN
(I reserve on No. 25),
JOHN R. PILLION,
Managers on the Part of the House.

○

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 11, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend David P. Small, Jr., pastor, Fair-Park Baptist Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

From the Apostle Paul to the Church at Rome: *The authorities are in God's service and to these duties they devote their energies.*—Romans 13: 1–6.

Eternal God, Thou hast taught us to call Thee our Father. We believe with all of our mind and heart that Thou didst lead our fathers to establish in our land a new nation conceived in liberty. Grant that we, their children, may ever be mindful of Thee, without whom no people can prosper or dwell secure.

We pause now to offer from grateful hearts our gratitude for Thy constant goodness to us, our families, and our Nation. Pardon, we beseech Thee, our sins. We have disobeyed Thy holy laws, seeking to enrich and exalt ourselves at the cost of privation and suffering to others. O God, turn us to Thee in hearty repentance and true humility that we may learn Thy will, in which is to be found our peace.

Bless, we beseech Thee, our President, and all who are associated with him in their awesome duties. May their performance be such as to bring honor and blessing to our Nation as well as the nations of our world. Give to these Thy servants of this deliberative body the repose of mind, born of our unfaltering faith in Thee. Enable them to see beyond the disconcerting forces and problems of the present moment. In this moment renew their vision and quest of their noblest self and highest ideals.

As these Thy servants give themselves to their respective duties of the day may they so discharge them that "this government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish" from our beloved America and that from their deliberations and actions of this session such a government may one day become the reality of all mankind around the world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4479. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of California of certain mineral rights reserved to the United States in certain real property in California; and

H.R. 5691. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to allow the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to delegate to the Chief Medical Director in the Department of Medicine and Surgery, authority to act upon the recommendations of the disciplinary boards provided by section 4110 of title 38, United States Code.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 221. An act to amend chapter 35 of title 38, United States Code, to provide educational assistance to the children of veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from an injury or disease arising out of active military, naval, or air service during a period of war or the induction period.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2064. An act to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guaranty revolving fund.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during general debate, Thursday, December 12.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

THE FOREIGN AID APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, I have had the principal responsibility for the foreign aid money bill for 9 years. It is a most difficult bill to deal with, but during that 9 years, I have never made a commitment that I did not live up to, which is a statement of fact that I make with modesty but considerable personal satisfaction.

I know the membership is anxious to dispose of the foreign aid appropriations, but it must be understood that we do not yet have an authorization approved either on the mutual security program, the Peace Corps, or the Inter-American Bank, all of which must be provided for in this money bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am anxious to do all that I can to expedite the handling of this bill. I shall, therefore, ask unanimous consent that we may have until midnight Saturday to file the report to accompany the bill so that our subcommittee may have the opportunity, meantime, to mark up the bill and then go before the full Committee on Appropriations, with our efforts being directed toward trying to get the bill to the floor of the House on Monday.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT ON THE FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight Saturday, December 14, 1963, to file a report on the foreign aid appropriations bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the report of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to state to the gentleman who just had the floor that I do not know anything about any meeting on this bill. I am a member of the subcommittee but I have not been informed as yet why the committee cannot meet this afternoon or tomorrow morning and then report the bill to the full committee Friday and then this motion would not be necessary.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am willing to do anything that I can in order to expedite the consideration of this bill, as I am sure the gentleman knows. However, there are certain members of the subcommittee who are not in town, but who plan to be here within a day or two. Therefore, in planning a schedule, I am trying to take into account that fact, as it is certainly desirable to have all of the members present to participate in the markup of the bill. As for myself, personally, I am ready to proceed at any time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sure the gentleman from Louisiana will remember that the date upon which we agreed to mark the bill was today. I came back from my district expecting to do this today. The gentleman from Massachusetts, I happen to know, has rearranged his schedule to be here today as has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MINSHALL]. Thus far I have not had any explanation as to why we will not mark up the bill today and proceed in the usual order to bring the bill to the

floor. If we marked up today, we could take the bill to the full committee on Friday, file the report, and take the bill to the floor on Monday or Tuesday, giving the Members time to look at the report. I have not seen the report myself. I may want to file minority views: I do not know. It is most irregular to ask this unanimous-consent request before the subcommittee has even marked up the bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say that, as chairman of the subcommittee, it has consistently been my policy to adjust the time of the markup of the bill, as well as the hearings, to accommodate members of the subcommittee. As the distinguished gentleman from Arizona recognizes, we had planned originally to mark up the bill on Monday, December 9. However, the gentleman said he would be out of town, so we moved the markup of the bill to Friday, as a tentative arrangement. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], was one of the members of the subcommittee who was out of the city, and I do not know now whether he has returned or not.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I understood the situation, the gentleman from Louisiana did not want to mark up the bill on Monday because of the fact that there had been an election in Louisiana late in the week before. The gentleman from Michigan could not be in town Tuesday, but he is here today. I thought today was agreed upon as the date for the markup of the bill because everyone would be here.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. In the absence of action by the other body on authorizing legislation pertaining to matters that would be contained in the foreign aid bill, would the subject matter such as the appropriation for the Peace Corps, be subject to a point of order if the appropriation bill is called up on Monday?

The SPEAKER. In response to the gentleman's parliamentary inquiry, all appropriation bills and general appropriations are dependent upon authorizations.

Mr. GROSS. Those matters, then, would be subject to a point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair, in answer to the parliamentary inquiry, would say they would be unless authorized.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, there was an election in Louisiana on Saturday, but the chairman of this subcommittee arrived back in Washington on Sunday and would have been available for a markup on Monday, but it was agreed that we would not proceed on that schedule. I am personally willing to proceed with the bill at any time the members of the subcommittee are present and prepared to participate in the markup.

Mr. CONTE. I would like to know when we are going to have the markup. I understand the markup was to be on Wednesday, and that was postponed until Friday. I do not know whether there is going to be a markup on Friday or Saturday. The gentleman from Arizona told me this 2 days ago. I think we ought to be notified when and where we are going to have a markup so that we can plan our schedule accordingly. I want the House to know we completed hearings on this bill on August 19, and we have been sitting idly by since August 19. If the authorization bill is not passed, either for the Peace Corps or any other part of the aid bill, I will raise a point of order against consideration of the foreign aid.

Mr. PASSMAN. I am pleased to state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the plan is to mark up the bill on Friday, December 13. Notice to that effect went out to the subcommittee members today. We plan to go to the full committee on Saturday, and to bring the bill to the floor of the House on Monday.

Mr. CONTE. First of all I want to inform the gentleman from Louisiana that I can say for my side that four Republican members are here. We can meet within the hour called by the chairman of the committee. I can speak only for the Republicans.

Second, I believe it would be tremendously unfair to the Members of the House, let alone a committee member, to come in here with a report on Monday morning and have a vote on the bill on the floor of the House without even having the opportunity to read the report before you vote on it in committee. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. PASSMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, let me say that I am prepared to bring the bill out on Christmas Eve if such procedure should be necessary.

Mr. CONTE. The gentleman may have a bag of gifts, and his Santa Claus uniform for Chiristmas Eve as he states and I hope he has the civil rights bill in that bag of gifts.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the request.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H.R. 9140, the public works appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1027)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 7, 9, 10, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 8, 11, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 35; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$19,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$827,146,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$154,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$77,862,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$10,294,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$185,431,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,342,669,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$400,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$47,142,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

"Public works acceleration

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $30,000,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 5, and 19.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN
(I reserve on No. 25),
JOHN R. PILLION,
Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
PAT MCNAMARA,
JOHN O. PASTORE,
ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Corps of Engineers—Civil

General Investigations

Amendment No. 1: Appropriates $19,115,000 instead of $18,000,000 as proposed by the House and $20,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	Conference
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
1. Surveys:		
(a) Navigation studies	$1,535,000	$2,164,000
(b) Flood control studies	4,440,000	5,351,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	350,000	400,000
(d) Comprehensive basin studies:		
Big Black River, Miss.	25,000	25,000
Big Muddy River, Ill.	115,000	115,000
Brazos River Basin, Tex.	200,000	200,000
Colorado River, Tex.	215,000	215,000
Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N.H.	250,000	250,000
Fox River, Wis.	75,000	75,000
Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa.	150,000	150,000
Grand River Basin, Mich.	200,000	200,000
Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C.	150,000	150,000
Missouri River Basin	250,000	250,000
Neches River, Tex.	110,000	110,000
Ohio River Basin review	775,000	775,000
Pascagoula River Basin, Miss.	150,000	150,000
Pearl River Basin, Miss.	100,000	100,000
Puget Sound area, Washington	150,000	150,000
Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.	250,000	250,000
Sabine River, Tex.	115,000	115,000
St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo.	25,000	25,000
St. Johns River Basin, Maine	85,000	85,000
St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind.	100,000	100,000
Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md.	330,000	330,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	325,000	325,000
Wabash River, Ind. and Ill.	250,000	250,000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo.	250,000	250,000
Willamette River Basin, Oreg.	350,000	350,000
(e) Special studies:		
Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas	50,000	50,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana	50,000	125,000
Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.)	300,000	300,000
GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS—Continued		
1. Surveys—Continued		
(e) Special studies—Continued		
Great Lakes water levels	$40,000	$40,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y.	200,000	250,000
Hurricane studies	387,000	387,000
Jersey Meadows, N.Y., and N.J.	150,000	150,000
Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.	200,000	250,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska	197,000	197,000
San Francisco Bay area survey, California	90,000	90,000
Texas coast	250,000	250,000
Hudson River siltation study	----------	55,000
General reduction applied against basin surveys	----------	−1,500,000
Subtotal, surveys	13,234,000	13,554,000
2. Collection and study of basic data:		
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	280,000	280,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	480,000	480,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	210,000	210,000
International water studies	85,000	85,000
Flood plain studies	715,000	715,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	1,770,000	1,770,000
3. Research and development:		
Beach erosion development studies	820,000	820,000
Hydrologic studies	185,000	185,000
Engineering studies	1,365,000	1,365,000
Plan formulation and evaluation studies	100,000	100,000
Mississippi Basin model:		
(1) Construction	461,000	461,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	210,000	210,000
Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	1,915,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, research and development	5,056,000	4,341,000
General reduction due to slippage	----------	−550,000
Total, general investigations	20,060,000	19,115,000

Flood control studies.—The amount provided includes $25,000 for the Skunk and Squaw Creeks, Iowa survey.

Construction General

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates $827,146,500 instead of $798,282,700 as proposed by the House and $849,856,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are to be allocated as shown in the following tabulation:

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Holt lock and dam	$7,700,000	----------	$7,700,000	----------
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam	----------	$250,000	----------	$250,000
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	2,000,000	----------	2,000,000	----------
(N)	Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel	1,000,000	----------	1,000,000	----------
(FC)	Paint Rock River	231,000	----------	231,000	----------
(MP)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (national wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia)	500,000	----------	500,000	----------
	West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)				

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alaska:				
(N)	Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin			$921,000	
(MP)	Snettisham power project		$225,000		$225,000
	Arizona:				
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	$2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Tucson diversion channel	1,750,000		1,750,000	
	Arkansas:				
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:				
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	11,000,000		11,000,000	
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	10,300,000		10,300,000	
(MP)	Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri	567,000		567,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC)	De Queen Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(MP)	Degray Reservoir	2,350,000		2,350,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Garland City			250,000	
(FC)	Gillam Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	2,917,000		2,917,000	
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension			200,000	
(FC)	McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas				44,000
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	15,600,000		15,600,000	
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	100,000		100,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Ozark lock and dam		285,000		285,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts				37,500
	California:				
(FC)	Alameda Creek		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir				125,000
(FC)	Camanche Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek				20,000
(R)	Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor				95,000
(FC)	Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement		150,000		200,000
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	610,000		610,000	
(N)	Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor	1,350,000		1,350,000	
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)				
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Mormon Slough				50,000
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000	
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	8,000,000		4,555,000	
(N)	Redondo Beach King Harbor	950,000		950,000	
(N)	Redwood City Harbor			660,000	
(FC)	Redwood Creek		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	335,000		335,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,500,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project	900,000		840,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant)	†100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Tahchevah Creek			200,000	
(BE)	Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)	122,000		122,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	100,000		300,000	
(FC)	West Fork Reservoir		80,000		80,000
	Colorado:				
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		86,000		86,000
	Connecticut:				
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(R)	Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments)		60,000		60,000
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir	685,000		685,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	New London Barrier				50,000
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir	900,000		900,000	
(BE)	Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement)	32,000		32,000	
(FC)	Stamford	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir		90,000		90,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	1,700,000		1,700,000	
	Delaware:				
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes)	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	831,000		831,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Florida:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Bakers Haulover Inlet	204,000		250,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	14,000,000		14,750,000	
(N)	Cross Florida barge canal	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Intercoastal Waterway:				
	(a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	950,000		1,200,000	
	(b) Jacksonville to Miami	2,085,000		2,085,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	9,000		9,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor			250,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	575,000		575,000	

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Georgia:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(MP)	Carters Dam	$2,200,000		$2,200,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C.			270,000	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)				
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.		$350,000		$350,000
	Hawaii:				
(N)	Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000
(R)	Kahului Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Kaunakakai Harbor				100,000
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	766,000		766,000	
	Idaho:				
(FC)	Boise Valley	409,000		409,000	
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir		375,000		375,000
	Illinois:				
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	1,400,000		1,400,000	
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:				
	(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)	500,000		500,000	
	(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	5,700,000		5,700,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Chicago Harbor—1962 act				27,000
(FC)	Clear Lake Special Drainage District		51,000		51,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Freeport		100,000		100,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District		100,000		100,000
	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)				
(N)	Kaskaskia River		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred)		10,000		10,000
(FC)	McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District		80,000		80,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:				
	(a) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Mount Carmel	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir		501,000		501,000
(FC)	Richland Creek		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee			150,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown)	695,000		695,000	
(FC)	Sny Island Levee Drainage District		166,000		166,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Tri-Pond levee			300,000	
	Indiana:				
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)				
(N)	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	9,871,000		9,871,000	
(FC)	Evansville	800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)				
(FC)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois				50,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	825,000		825,000	
(FC)	Mason J. Niblack levee	650,000		650,000	
	McAlpine lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)				
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	3,520,000		3,520,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000
	Iowa:				
	Charlton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)				
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge			150,000	
(FC)	Dubuque				35,000
(FC)	Floyd River and tributaries	3,800,000		3,722,000	
(FC)	Indian Creek Dam		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Little Sioux River	1,148,000		1,148,000	
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:				
	(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	6,000,000		6,000,000	
	(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,700,000		2,700,000	
	(c) Kansas City to the mouth	2,700,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir			400,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	11,200,000		11,200,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir			400,000	
	Kansas:				
(FC)	Atchison		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Big Hill Reservoir				35,000
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Council Grove Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Dodge City		185,000		185,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000	
(FC)	John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans., and Mo.	580,000		580,000	
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Merriam				50,000
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	14,925,000		14,925,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Osawatomie		39,000		39,000
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Pomona Reservoir	1,887,000		1,887,000	
(FC)	Topeka	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	6,600,000		6,600,000	

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Kentucky:				
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	$27,000,000		$27,000,000	
(FC)	Barren River Reservoir	7,067,000		7,067,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(N)	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,200,000		9,200,000	
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir		$320,000		$250,000
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir		220,000		220,000
(MP)	Celina Dam (deferred)		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Corbin	270,000		270,000	
(FC)	Cumberland		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Eagle Creek Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	4,220,000		4,220,000	
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
(FC)	Red River Reservoir		50,000		50,000
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)				
	Louisiana:				
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	4,200,000		4,200,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier		103,000	47,000	103,000
(FC)	Campti Clarence levee		23,000	100,000	23,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	800,000		800,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	9,000,000		9,000,000	
FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	100,000		100,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)				
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Twelve Mile Bayou			[1] (258,000)	
	Maine:				
(N)	Narragaugus River			500,000	
(N)	Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	2,000,000		1,500,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)				
(N)	Searsport Harbor (1962 act)	718,000		718,000	
	Maryland:				
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel	4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va		100,000		100,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal) part II. (See Delaware.)				
	Massachusetts:				
(N)	Boston Harbor, Chelsea River				40,000
(R)	Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Chicopee Falls	1,385,000		1,385,000	
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservoir	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Gloucester Harbor			500,000	
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	3,634,000		3,634,000	
(N)	Plymouth Harbor (1962 act)				35,000
(BE)	Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000	
(FC)	Three Rivers	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Wareham-Marion		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Westfield		100,000		100,000
	Michigan:				
(R)	Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)		30,000		30,000
(N)	Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	1,485,000		1,485,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor			200,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000		800,000	
(R)	Ludington Harbor (north revetment)	150,000		150,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	300,000		300,000	
(R)	Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.)				
(N)	Muskegon Harbor		18,000	100,000	
(R)	Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Rouge River		200,000		200,000
(N)	St. Marys River: New Poe lock	242,000		500,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	600,000		600,000	
	Minnesota:				
(N)	Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:				
	(a) Inner harbor, 27-foot and 23-foot channels	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	(b) Outer harbor, 32-foot to 27-foot channels	1,162,000		1,162,000	
(FC)	Marshall, Redwood River	696,000		696,000	
(R)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)	200,000		200,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Winona	200,000		200,000	
	Mississippi:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson	1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Natchez			115,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)				
	Missouri:				
	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Canton	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo			400,000	
(FC)	Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Hannibal		150,000		150,000
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir		300,000		350,000
	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)				
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		650,000		650,000
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)				
	Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	330,000		330,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000	
	Montana:				
(MP)	Libby Reservoir		1,000,000		1,000,000

Footnote at end of tables.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Nebraska:				
(FC)	Clarkson			[1] ($205,000)	
(FC)	Gering Valley	$650,000		650,000	
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek		$80,000		$80,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)				
(FC)	Norfolk		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	4,200,000		4,200,000	
	Nevada:				
(FC)	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev				100,000
	New Hampshire:				
(N)	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H			1,000,000	
	New Jersey:				
(R)	Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	2,200,000		2,200,000	
(R)	Manasquan River (bulkheads)	350,000		350,000	
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel			400,000	
(R)	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	690,000		690,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa., and N.J		250,000		250,000
	New Mexico:				
(FC)	Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act)		130,000		130,000
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir		308,000		308,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir		220,000		220,000
(FC)	Las Cruces		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Socorro	1,235,000		1,235,000	
	New York:				
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:				
	(a) Outer harbor (1962 modification)			250,000	
	(b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels	707,000		707,000	
(N)	Buttermilk Channel	700,000		700,000	
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet, Long Island	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	2,100,000		2,100,000	
(N)	Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act)	917,000		917,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	380,000		380,000	
(FC)	Herkimer	286,000		286,000	
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Ithaca, Cayuga Inlet			300,000	
(FC)	Lackawanna	300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River		100,000		100,000
(R)	Little Sodus Bay (piers)		20,000		20,000
	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), New York and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)				
(N)	Oswego Harbor (1962 act)				60,000
(N)	Rochester Harbor	1,025,000		1,025,000	
(FC)	Rosendale				100,000
(FC)	Salamanca				20,000
(FC)	South Amsterdam	700,000		700,000	
	North Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection		80,000		80,000
(BE)	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach			54,000	
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir				180,000
(FC)	Swift Creek			250,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)				135,000
	North Dakota:				
(FC)	Bowman Haley Reservoir			300,000	
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak			300,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)				
	Ohio:				
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor 27-30-foot channels, deepen turning area	383,000		383,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	7,000,000		12,000,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir		266,000		266,000
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Caesar Creek Reservoir				75,000
	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)				
(N)	Cleveland Harbor:				
	(a) Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	900,000		900,000	
	(b) Deepen East Basin to 27-28 feet (1952 act)				27,000
(R)	Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters)	300,000		300,000	
(N)	Conneaut Harbor			225,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir		216,000		216,000
(FC)	East Fork Reservoir				75,000
(FC)	Fremont		100,000		100,000
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		250,000		250,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	Manchester (deferred)				8,000
(FC)	North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor	1,531,000		1,531,000	
(R)	Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	370,000		370,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)				
(N)	Toledo Harbor	6,268,000		6,268,000	
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	3,700,000		3,700,000	
(N)	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia				150,000
(FC)	Youngstown, Crab Creek		50,000		50,000
	Oklahoma:				
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)				
(FC)	Bireb Reservoir		125,000		125,000
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Copan Reservoir				100,000
(MP)	Eufaula Reservoir	18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC)	Hugo Reservoir				100,000
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	15,500,000		15,500,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	1,500,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir		40,000		40,000
(N)	Webbers Falls lock and dam		370,000		370,000

Footnote at end of table.

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Oregon:				
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	$1,000,000		$1,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		$170,000		$170,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
(MP)	Cougar Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	3,740,000		3,740,000	
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	11,650,000		11,650,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	57,000,000		57,000,000	
(MP)	Lost Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor	1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin, channel improvement and major drainage: Shelton Ditch				10,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Pennsylvania:				
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	21,227,000		21,227,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir		240,000		240,000
(FC)	Bethlehem	370,000		370,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir		428,000		428,000
(FC)	Butler	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	6,800,000		6,800,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Eikland	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Latrobe		117,000		117,000
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Raystown Reservoir				150,000
(FC)	Scranton		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	10,800,000		10,800,000	
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)				
(FC)	Turtle Creek	3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir		150,000		150,000
	Puerto Rico:				
(N)	San Juan Harbor	4,633,000		4,633,000	
	Rhode Island:				
(FC)	Fox Point Barrier	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	1,450,000		1,450,000	
(FC)	Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier				50,000
(R)	Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters)	470,000		470,000	
(FC)	Point Judith—Hurricane barrier				50,000
	South Carolina:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
	South Dakota:				
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	23,800,000		23,800,000	
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000	
	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See North Dakota.)				
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	5,700,000		5,700,000	
	Tennessee:				
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)				
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam	2,400,000		4,800,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	3,700,000		4,800,000	
(BA)	Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn.	500,000		500,000	
	Texas:				
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)				
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	Big Fossil Creek	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	500,000		500,000	
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act)	†800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	3,682,000		3,682,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension		132,000		132,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity		60,000		60,000
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios				30,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,500,000		1,500,000	
(R)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes	562,000		562,000	
(N)	Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir				50,000
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		150,000		150,000
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	Pat Mayse Reservoir		100,000		100,000
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola	1,200,000		1,200,000	
(R)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)				
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway:				
	(a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo		300,000		300,000
	(b) Rectification and widening (1954 act)	2,138,000		2,138,000	
(MP)	Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	12,450,000		12,450,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	8,100,000		8,100,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FC)	Texas City	3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	Texas City channel (dikes)	835,000		835,000	
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir		200,000		200,000
	Vermont:				
(R)	Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	555,000		555,000	
(FC)	Victory Reservoir (deferred)		65,000		65,000
	Virginia:				
(R)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.)	620,000		620,000	
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Norfolk	250,000		250,000	
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000	

	Construction, general, State and project	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Washington:				
(FC)	Colfax	$600,000		$600,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(FC)	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		$39,000		$39,000
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)				
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam		884,000		884,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	23,000,000		23,000,000	
(N)	Port Townsend	598,000		598,000	
(FC)	Pullman		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Sammamish River	729,000		729,000	
(N)	Swinomish Slough			150,000	
(N)	Tacoma Harbor			150,000	
(FC)	Washougal area			100,000	
	West Virginia:				
(FC)	Barboursville			[1] (150,000)	
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)				
(FC)	Buckhannon		73,000		73,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir		280,000		280,000
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Justice Reservoir		300,000		300,000
	Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	5,058,000		5,058,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	10,900,000		10,900,000	
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)				
	Wisconsin:				
	Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)				
(FC)	Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	200,000		200,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)				50,000
(N)	Kenosha Harbor			200,000	
(R)	Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Kickapoo River				50,000
(R)	Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis.	400,000		400,000	
(N)	Milwaukee Harbor		40,000		40,000
(R)	Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	600,000		600,000	
(R)	Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier)	188,000		188,000	
(R)	Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal	400,000		400,000	
	Wyoming:				
(FC)	Jackson Hole	479,000		479,000	
	Miscellaneous:				
(FC)	Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation	4,000,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing			750,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000	2,000,000		2,000,000	
(BE)	Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000	50,000		50,000	
	Projects deferred for restudy		(150,000)	(158,000)	
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,000,000	
	Small authorized projects	2,128,000		2,750,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000	
(R)	Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Employees compensation	72,000		72,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−65,000,000		−75,000,000	
	General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities			−3,000,000	
	Grand total, construction, general	800,471,000 (819,486,000)	19,015,000	805,656,000 (827,146,500)	21,490,500

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

Central and southern Florida.—The increase above the House figure includes $500,000 for beginning construction on Canal C–111, and the Cutler Drain.

Operation and Maintenance, General

Amendment No. 3: Appropriates $154,000,000 instead of $150,000,000 as proposed by the House and $157,368,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Flood Control, Mississippi River and Tributaries

Amendment No. 4: Appropriates $77,862,000 instead of $74,500,000 as proposed by the House and $80,406,000 as proposed by the Senate. Funds provided are to be distributed as follows:

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:				
(a) Examinations and surveys	$25,000		$25,000	
(b) Collection and study of basic data	85,000		85,000	
Subtotal, general investigations	110,000		110,000	
2. Construction and planning:				
Mississippi River levees	2,580,000		2,700,000	
Channel improvement	26,500,000		27,250,000	
Memphis Harbor	1,200,000		1,200,000	
Old River control	1,225,000		1,225,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower White River	850,000		850,000	
Cache River	50,000			
West Tennessee tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	395,000		395,000	
Lower Arkansas	400,000		400,000	
Tensas Basin:				
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,500,000		1,500,000	
2. Construction and planning—Con.				
Yazoo Basin:				
Sardis Reservoir	$58,000		$58,000	
Enid Reservoir	56,000		56,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	49,000		49,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	1,300,000		1,300,000	
Main stem	2,200,000		2,200,000	
Tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	1,100,000		1,100,000	
Yazoo backwater	1,700,000		1,700,000	
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries	50,000		50,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	7,000,000		7,500,000	
Lake Pontchartrain			182,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	54,250,000		55,752,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,500,000		−1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning	52,750,000		54,252,000	
3. Maintenance	22,000,000		23,500,000	
Grand total	74,860,000		77,862,000	

U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River

Joint Board of Engineers

Amendment No. 5: Reported in disagreement.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

Operating expenses

Amendment No. 6: Appropriates $25,725,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Capital outlay

Amendment No. 7: Appropriates $6,500,000 as proposed by the House instead of $7,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Limitation on general and administrative expenses, Panama Canal Company

Amendment No. 8: Limits funds for administrative expenses to $9,285,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10: Provide for the purchase of 16 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of 21 passenger motor vehicles of which 16 are for replacement only as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11: Limits the cost of one limousine to $7,800 as proposed by the Senate instead of $6,300 as proposed by the House.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Bureau of Reclamation

General investigations

Amendment No. 12: Appropriates $10,294,000 instead of $9,894,000 as proposed by the House and $10,442,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided above the House figure include all of the specific items set forth in the Senate report, including $200,000 for comprehensive basin surveys.

Amendment No. 13: Provides that $8,902,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $8,621,000 as proposed by the House shall be derived from the reclamation fund.

Amendment No. 14: Provides $340,000 as proposed by the House instead of $388,000 as proposed by the Senate for transfer to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Construction and rehabilitation

Amendment No. 15: Appropriates $185,431,000 instead of $180,190,000 as proposed by the House and $187,425,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds provided under this heading are to be distributed as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
Arizona:				
Colorado River front work and levee system	$4,350,000	----------	$4,550,000	----------
Gila project	2,855,000	----------	2,855,000	----------
Parker-Davis project	973,000	----------	973,000	----------
California:				
Central Valley project	50,445,000	----------	48,295,000	----------
Colorado River front work and levee system. (See Arizona.)				
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, initial phase. (See Nevada.)				
Colorado:				
Denver office computer	1,300,000	----------	1,300,000	----------
Fryingpan-Arkansas project	1,600,000	----------	1,600,000	----------
Trinidad project	----------	$7,000	----------	$7,000
Idaho: Mann Creek project	----------	150,000	----------	150,000
Kansas: Wichita project, Cheney division	3,800,000	----------	3,800,000	----------
Nevada:				
Parker-Davis project. (See Arizona.)				
Washoe project, initial phase	----------	110,000	----------	110,000
New Mexico: Rio Grande project, recreational facilities	460,000	----------	300,000	----------
Oklahoma:				
Arbuckle project	1,800,000	----------	1,800,000	----------
Norman project	7,400,000	----------	7,400,000	----------
Oregon:				
Baker project, upper division	----------	200,000	----------	200,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir	300,000	----------	300,000	----------
The Dalles project, Western division	3,150,000	----------	3,150,000	----------
Vale project, Bully Creek extension	642,000	----------	642,000	----------
Texas:				
Canadian River project	23,000,000	----------	23,000,000	----------
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, La Feria division	1,500,000	----------	1,500,000	----------
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation, Mercedes division	1,400,000	----------	1,400,000	----------
Utah:				
Weber Basin project	11,309,000	----------	11,309,000	----------
Washington:				
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division	1,325,000	----------	1,325,000	----------
Chief Joseph Dam project, Oroville-Tonasket unit	----------	225,000	----------	225,000
Columbia Basin project	3,900,000	----------	4,650,000	----------
Spokane Valley project	600,000	----------	600,000	----------
Various:				
Drainage and minor construction program	2,432,000	----------	2,432,000	----------
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,943,000	----------	3,943,000	----------
Reclamation office building	----------	----------	350,000	----------
Subtotal, exclusive of Missouri River Basin project	128,484,000	692,000	127,474,000	692,000
MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT				
Colorado:				
Narrows unit, South Platte division	----------	$139,000	----------	$139,000
North Republic unit. (See Nebraska.)				
Kansas:				
Almena unit	$5,580,000	----------	$3,983,000	----------
Glen Elder unit	5,000,000	----------	5,000,000	----------
Kanopolis unit, Smoky Hill division	----------	10,000	----------	----------
Wilson unit, Smoky Hill division	----------	129,000	----------	129,000
Montana:				
Chestnut Valley unit, Helena-Great Falls division	----------	3,000	----------	3,000
Cracker Box, Marsh, and Stipek units, Yellowstone division	----------	54,000	----------	54,000
East Bench unit	4,400,000	----------	4,400,000	----------
Jefferson and Whitehall units, Three Forks division	----------	97,700	----------	97,700
West Branch unit, Three Forks division	----------	27,000	----------	27,000
Yellowtail unit	19,000,000	----------	19,000,000	----------
Nebraska:				
Ainsworth unit	8,100,000	----------	8,100,000	----------
Cedar Rapids division	----------	195,000	----------	195,000
Farwell unit	5,000,000	----------	5,000,000	----------
Frenchman Cambridge division	1,787,000	----------	1,787,000	----------
North Republican unit, upper Republican division	----------	84,000	----------	84,000
North Dakota:				
Garrison diversion unit, Garrison division	----------	54,000	----------	54,000
South Dakota:				
Crazy Horse, Tower, Greenwood, and Yankton units, South Dakota pumping division	----------	5,300	----------	5,300
Garrison diversion unit. (See North Dakota.)				
Joe Creek, Culdesac, and Rousseau units, South Dakota pumping division	----------	92,000	----------	92,000
Oahe unit, James division	----------	253,000	----------	186,500
Oahe unit, James section	365,000	----------	365,000	----------
Wyoming:				
Kaycee unit, Powder division	----------	200,000	----------	133,500
Yellowtail unit. (See Montana.)				
Various:				
Transmission division	23,956,000	----------	23,275,000	----------
Drainage and minor construction program	2,258,000	----------	2,258,000	----------
Subtotal, construction and advance planning (MRB)	75,446,000	1,343,000	73,168,000	1,200,000
Investigations	1,824,000	----------	1,717,000	----------
Other Department agencies	3,322,300	----------	3,180,000	----------
Total, Missouri River Basin project	80,592,300	1,343,000	78,065,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	211,111,300		207,431,000	
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−15,351,000		−22,000,000	
Total, construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000		185,431,000	

Central Valley project.—The conferees are in agreement that none of the available funds shall be used for reimbursement to the Westlands Water District for preconstruction work in connection with the proposed water distribution system since there is no authority in law for such reimbursement. They are also in agreement that funds budgeted for the Trinity River division should be used to initiate construction on both the Cow Creek unit and the Clear Creek South unit.

Reclamation office building.—The conferees are in agreement that a new building is needed for the Bureau of Reclamation at the Denver Federal Center, and have provided $350,000 for preconstruction planning and design. However, the construction funds for such a building should be budgeted under the General Services Administration.

Loan Program

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates $12,367,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $12,217,000 as proposed by the House.

Upper Colorado River storage project

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates $97,989,200 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $97,845,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 18: Provides that $3,952,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,809,000 as proposed by the House shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities.

Funds provided under this heading are distributed as follows:

State and project	Budget estimate, fiscal year 1964 (as amended)		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Advance planning	Construction	Advance planning
COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT				
Arizona:				
Glen Canyon unit	$25,360,000		$25,360,000	
Colorado:				
Curecanti unit	18,822,000		18,822,000	
Utah:				
Glen Canyon unit. (See Arizona.)				
Flaming Gorge unit	4,639,381		4,639,381	
Wyoming:				
Flaming Gorge unit. (See Utah.)				
Transmission division	37,670,000		36,000,000	
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS				
Colorado:				
Florida project	2,255,000		2,255,000	
San Juan-Chama project	1,600,000		1,600,000	
Silt project	500,000		500,000	
New Mexico:				
San Juan-Chama project. (See Colorado.)				
Utah:				
Central Utah project, initial phase		$1,721,300		$1,400,000
Emery County project	3,853,000		3,853,000	
Lyman project. (See Wyoming.)				
PARTICIPATING PROJECTS—con.				
Wyoming:				
Lyman project	$600,000		$600,000	
Seedskadee project	6,000,000		6,000,000	
Drainage and minor construction program	64,619		64,619	
Quality of water studies		$73,700		$73,700
Subtotal	101,364,000	1,795,000	99,694,000	1,473,700
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−6,181,000		−7,131,000	
Total, Upper Colorado River Basin fund	96,978,000		94,036,700	
RECREATIONAL AND FISH AND WILDLIFE FACILITIES				
National Park Service	3,000,000		2,795,000	
Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife	1,309,000		1,157,500	
Total, recreational and fish and wildlife	4,309,000		3,952,500	
Total, Upper Colorado River storage project	101,287,000		97,989,200	

Administrative Provisions

Amendment No. 19: Reported in disagreement.

Bonneville Power Administration

Construction

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates $36,204,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $36,000,000 as proposed by the House.

The managers on the part of the House concur in the Senate report language concerning Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest interconnections.

Operation and Maintenance

Amendment No. 21: Appropriates $13,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of $13,200,000 as proposed by the House.

Southwestern Power Administration

Continuing Fund

The conferees direct that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration, nor shall the Southwestern Power Administration promote the construction of steam generating facilities or associated transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Atomic Energy Commission

Operating Expenses

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates $2,342,669,000 instead of $2,308,169,000 as proposed by the House and $2,369,524,000 as proposed by the Senate. The funds appropriated under this heading are distributed as follows:

Item	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	Conference allowance
Raw materials	$324,843,000	$320,000,000
Special nuclear materials	480,471,000	475,000,000
Weapons	782,969,000	782,969,000
Reactor development	530,548,000	508,500,000
Physical research	219,077,000	197,137,000
Biology and medicine	76,973,000	71,645,000
Training, education and information	17,194,000	15,850,000
Isotopes development program	9,260,000	8,360,000
Civilian applications of nuclear explosives	15,100,000	13,500,000
Community program	10,081,000	10,081,000
Program direction and administration	73,415,000	72,560,000
Security investigation program	$6,950,000	$6,950,000
Cost of work for others	6,240,000	6,240,000
Change in selected resources	53,252,000	36,750,000
Resources received from other sources	−32,000,000	−32,000,000
Unobligated balance brought forward	−150,873,000	−150,873,000
Unobligated balance carried forward and miscellaneous adjustments		
Transfer in 1964 estimates		
Total	2,423,500,000	2,342,669,000

Reactor development.—The increase above the House figure includes $3,000,000 for cooperative arrangements with utilities and equipment manufacturers for the construction of civilian power reactors. The conferees agree that none of these funds are to be used for arrangements involving light water reactors of already proven types. The increase also includes $3,500,000 for the "seed and blanket" reactor concept.

Physical research.—The increase above the House figure includes $1,000,000 for the controlled thermonuclear research program.

Change in selected resources.—The increase above the House figure includes $6,000,000 for the civilian nuclear power cooperative program.

Plant and capital equipment

Amendment No. 23: Appropriates $400,000,000 instead of $380,000,000 as proposed by the House and $418,695,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The increase above the House figure includes $17,945,000 for 12 weapons construction projects approved by supplemental authorization in connection with safeguards under the nuclear test ban treaty, and $750,000 for a community building at Los Alamos, N. Mex. It is expected that normal replacement and maintenance will be carried on at the Puerto Rico Training Center.

Tennessee Valley Authority

Payment to Tennessee Valley Authority Fund

Amendment No. 24: Appropriates $47,142,000 instead of $46,000,000 as proposed by the House and $48,284,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV

Funds appropriated to the President

Public Works Acceleration

Amendment No. 25: Appropriates $30,000,000 instead of $45,000,000 as proposed by

the Senate. Of the amount provided $2,000,000 is for the administration of the going program for which $850,000,000 has already been appropriated.

The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated, except for the $2,000,000 for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects.

TITLE V

General provisions

Amendments Nos. 26 through 35: Change title and section numbers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
JOHN E. FOGARTY,
BEN F. JENSEN
(I reserve on No. 25),
JOHN R. PILLION,
Managers on the Part of the House.

PART II, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE, "JUDICIARY AND JUDICIAL PROCEDURE"

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 4157) to enact part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure" codifying the general and and permanent laws relating to the judiciary and judicial procedure of the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Senate amendments.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, all of these amendments are clerical in nature and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent that they be considered as read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I ask the gentleman from Louisiana if this is the matter which he brought before the Committee on the Judiciary at its meeting yesterday and relates only to technical amendments to a codification bill.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman is correct and the committee unanimously directed me to bring the matter up this morning.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if all of these amendments, and I believe the gentleman referred to 41 amendments, are germane to the bill?

Mr. WILLIS. The amendments are germane to the bill and are clerical in nature.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana that the Senate amendments be considered as read?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments are as follows:

Page 7, line 8, strike out "September 1, 1963" and insert "January 1, 1964".

Page 19, line 19, after "as" insert "otherwise"

Page 26, line 27, after "until" insert "the removal of such diability, and".

Page 26, line 34, after "appoint" insert "from the eligible list of the Civil Service Commission,".

Page 29, line 7, strike out "or".

Page 29, line 9, strike out "or".

Page 30, strike out lines 24 to 27, inclusive, and insert "The Juvenile Court has original and exclusive jurisdiction of proceedings to determine paternity of any child alleged to have been born out of wedlock and to provide for his support in the manner provided by subschapter II of chapter 23 of Title 16.".

Page 33, line 14, after "duties," insert "upon conviction thereof,".

Page 50, line 12, strike out "persons" and insert "persons.".

Page 63, line 30, strike out "defendants," and insert "defendant's".

Page 66, line 19, strike out "debtor" and insert "defendant".

Page 66, line 38, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 67, line 32, strike out "on" and insert "or".

Page 79, line 27, strike out "action" and insert "actions".

Page 92, line 25, strike out "affidavits" and insert "testimony".

Page 93, line 24, strike out "any interest in".

Page 101, line 40, strike out "property" where it appears the first time and insert "estate".

Page 101, line 40, strike out "property" where it appears the second time and insert "estate".

Page 102, line 2, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 102, line 7, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 102, line 8, strike out "property" and insert "estate".

Page 110, line 26, strike out "15–710(b)(2)" and insert "15–709(b)(2)".

Page 113, line 8, strike out "on intestate share".

Page 114, line 18, strike out "for" and insert "from".

Page 115, strike out lines 29 to 37, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 16–912. Permanent alimony; enforcement; retention of dower.

"When a divorce is granted to the wife, the court may decree her permanent alimony sufficient for her support and that of any minor children whom the court assigns to her care, and secure and enforce the payment of the alimony in the manner prescribed by section 16–911, and may, if it seems appropriate, retain to the wife her right of dower in the husband's estate; and the court may, in similar circumstances, retain to the husband his right of dower in the wife's estate.".

Page 116, line 3, strike out "granted" and insert "granting".

Page 142, line 17, strike out "favor;" and insert "favor,".

Page 149, line 40, strike out "is" and insert "are".

Page 150, line 5, strike out "who has the" and insert "or persons who have".

Page 155, line 25, strike out "so construed" and insert "liberally construed so".

Page 161, line 8, strike out all after "persons" down to and including "twelve" in line 10.

Page 164, line 20, after "Widow" insert "or widower".

Page 164, line 38, after "widow's" insert "or widower's".

Page 168, line 39, strike out "widowers" and insert "witnesses".

Page 177, line 36, strike out "service or publication," and insert "service,".

Page 180, lines 43 and 44, strike out "All actions filed in the Branch shall be made returnable therein." and insert "Where, in a case controlled by another statute, a greater or lesser time for hearing is specified by the other statute, that specified time is controlling. All actions filed in the Branch shall be made returnable therein.".

Page 181, line 11, strike out " 'informa pauperis' " and insert " 'in forma pauperis' ".

Page 193, line 32, strike out "September 1, 1963" and insert "January 1, 1964".

Page 196, line 1, strike out "September 1, 1963" and insert "January 1, 1964".

Page 196, line 8, strike out "February 1, 1963" and insert "August 10, 1963".

Page 205, in the table "Statutes at Large" in the last line of the column "Section" where it appears for the first time, strike out "5(b)(1),".

Page 205, at the end of the table and as a part of the table "Statutes at Large," insert:

"1963—July 8	88–60	2, 3	77	77	11–755, 11–756
Do	88–60	4	77	78	11–756
Do	88–60	5	77	78	11–520a, 11–771a
Aug. 5	88–85	1, 2	77	117	11–805"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana to concur in the Senate amendments?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHOCKING STOCKPILING OF SUPPLIES BY NAVY PURCHASING OFFICE

(Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge by now that the procurement people in the Navy Department make enough mistakes daily to fill Mother Hubbard's biggest cupboard, but do they make so many mistakes that they have to be issued a new eraser every 3 days from Miss Wolfe's cupboard at the Navy Purchasing Office?

I hardly think so, but that is just one of several shocking examples of extravagant stockpiling of supplies which I have uncovered at the Navy Purchasing Office in a case that I call Miss Wolfe's cupboard. This case would be laughable except for the fact that it displays shocking conduct by naval personnel in regard to expenditure of the taxpayers' dollar. This, Mr. Speaker, is the most flagrant example of waste I have seen in my 22 years in Washington.

The examples I shall relate on the floor today were provided me by a Navy employee. He is a conscientious man. He tried to get the abuses corrected. Failing that, he came to me and asked my help. I have checked his record and referred every instance I shall mention here today to the General Accounting Office in the hope the Comptroller General will get to the bottom of this mess.

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my Appropriations Committee work I am ranking minority member on the District of Columbia Subcommittee. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] is our very able chairman. Each year we interrogate District officials as to their needs. We pin them down on one specific item

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only; should not be quoted or cited)

Issued Dec. 13, 1963
For actions of Dec. 12, 1963
88th-1st; No. 204

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,2,19,27,37
Area development.....32,33
Civil defense.....30
Cotton.....7,42
Economics.....16,31
Education.....15,39
Electrification.....4,34
Employment.....38
Expenditures.....28
Farm labor.....13,45
Fertilizer.....17
Flood control.....24,35
Foreign affairs.....46
Foreign currencies.....17
Foreign aid.....9,17,27
Foreign trade.....22
Forestry.....12
General provisions.....1
Grains.....8
Lands.....40
Legislative program.....27
Libraries.....14
Lumber.....26
Manpower.....20
Meat imports.....6,23
Opinion poll.....25
Peace Corps.....5
Personnel.....34,41
Public Law 480.....17
Public works.....1,37
Research.....17,29
River basins.....24
Roads.....11
Senior citizens.....44
Smoking.....18
Statistics.....16
Sugar.....3
Taxation.....28,43
Transportation.....10
Vocational education....21
Water compact.....36
Wools.....22

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on public works appropriation bill. Senate received President's message on prolongation of International Sugar Agreement. Senate passed State-Commerce-Justice appropriation bill. Sen. Talmadge urged enactment of Talmadge-Humphrey cotton bill. Sen. Lausche criticized REA programs and inserted GAO report. Sens. Simpson and Moss expressed concern over effects of meat imports. Sen. Dirksen inserted report urging enactment of new program for grains. House passed manpower development and training bill. House agreed to conference report on vocational education bill. Rep. Matthews favored quotas on cattle imports.

SENATE

1. PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 9140 (by a vote of 328 to 47 in the House; no record vote in Senate) (pp. 23071-9, 23233-46). This bill will now be sent to the President. As agreed to, the bill includes $30,000,000 for the public works acceleration program, of which $2,000,000 is for the administration of the going program, and general provisions applicable to the Government generally (see Digest 202 for a summary of these provisions).

2. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 7063 (pp. 23197, 23199-201, 23205-18). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 23218). As passed, the bill includes $13,500,000 for the Area Redevelopment Administration, and includes items for the Small Business Administration, Special Representative for Trade

Negotiations, and the Tariff Commission.

3. SUGAR Received from the President a protocol for the prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958; to Foreign Relations Committee. p. 23160

4. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from this Department proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a Rural Electrification Administration loan account; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. p. 23160
Sen. Lausche criticized the REA program, urged enactment of his bill to increase interest rates on REA loans and "more clearly define the areas and services for which loans to cooperatives could be made," and inserted excerpts from a GAO report which he stated "substantiates my contention that the REA has in numerous cases been negligent, used poor judgment, and did not exercise prudence in loaning the taxpayers' money." pp. 23201-5

5. PEACE CORPS. Passed without amendment H. R. 9009, to increase the appropriation authorization for the Peace Corps from $63,750,000 for fiscal year 1963 to $102,000,000 for fiscal year 1964. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 23164-7

6. MEAT IMPORTS. Sens Simpson and Moss expressed concern over the effects of meat imports on domestic industry, expressed opposition to further reductions in import duties on meat and meat products, and inserted several items on the matter. pp. 23175-6, 23189-92

7. COTTON. Sen. Talmadge expressed pleasure "that there appears to be growing public sentiment for a meaningful and economical cotton program such as that proposed by myself and the Senator from Minnesota," stated that the bill passed by the House "falls short of solving the total problem", and inserted several items in support of his position. pp. 23183-4

8. GRAINS. Sen. Dirksen inserted the report of the general manager of the Grain Terminal Association critical of the Government's grain production and marketing programs and urging enactment of new legislation in this field. pp. 23257-8

9. FOREIGN AID. Continued debate on the conference report on H. R. 7885, the foreign aid authorization bill, and agreed to vote on the question of adoption of the report Fri., Dec. 13. pp. 23218, 23220-7, 23247-51, 23264-74
Sen. Humphrey inserted several items reviewing the Alliance for Progress Program for Latin America. pp. 23254-7

10. TRANSPORTATION. The Commerce Committee reported with amendment S. 2317, to amend the Shipping Act of 1916 so as to provide for the exemption of certain terminal leases from penalties (S. Rept. 770). p. 23161

11. ROADS. Passed over, at the request of Sen. Mansfield, S. Res. 217, to authorize a study of a national system of scenic highways. p. 23167

12. FORESTRY. Sen. Mansfield commended the cooperative research project at Mont. State Univ. in which the Forest Service uses graduate students in physical education to test new types of equipment for use in the forests. pp. 23171-2

13. FARM LABOR. Sen. Mansfield commended the publication of a new book, "Selected State Programs in Migrant Education," and inserted an article on problems in providing education for migrants. pp. 23172-3

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of December 11, 1963.)

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, we present the conference report on the public works appropriation bill. There is no difference or controversy on the bill or the report. I shall avail myself of the right exercised in the other body where the rule of germaneness is not observed to diverge for the time being to other subjects.

May I in the first place felicitate the President of the United States on the statement released in this morning's newspapers in which he indicates conclusively that he proposes to carry out to the letter the platform adopted by his party at the 1960 convention.

It will be recalled that the committee on resolutions which formulated that platform was chaired by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who gave us the best platform ever adopted by any party.

May I also commend the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives and the equally distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate in the announcement in this morning's newspaper to the effect that they propose to give no consideration whatever to the absurd proposal that we go back to the old order of succession to the Presidency under which a member of the Cabinet succeeded the President and Vice President in event of a recurring vacancy in that office.

The members of the Cabinet are chosen for a multiplicity of reasons, none of which necessarily include their experience and competency to administer the complex, intricate and highly specialized requirements to serve as Chief Executive of the greatest nation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are many men in the United States capable of serving in the Cabinet. But the man who succeeds to the high office of the Presidency should be a man who is qualified by experience for that position.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is not only here because of the approval of the voters of his own congressional district and State but he is also here because he has been elected to the speakership by the vote of the Representatives of the people of the entire Nation and during his occupancy of that office has been in direct association with every national problem and is unquestionably the second most influential man in the Government.

There should be no change whatever in the present order of succession to the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, in the third place, may I again comment on the perennial agitation for a modernization of the rules of the House. It is an annual occasion for perfervid oratory which—like the poor—we have with us always. In every session there are those who claim the rules of the House should be refashioned and brought up to date. They take the position that the rules of the House, like women's hats, should change with the season. It brings to mind the comment of "Uncle Joe" Cannon who, on one occasion, cried from the Speaker's rostrum that Members claimed they are fettered by the rules who would not know the rules if they met them in the public road.

Parliamentary procedure is as exact a science as mathematics or physics or astronomy. And we can no more modernize the basic rules of parliamentary procedure than we can modernize the multiplication table.

It was said that the French Revolution was due to lack of proper parliamentary procedure in the French Chamber of Deputies. Jefferson, himself, who compiled the first parliamentary manual in the history of the American Congress, based on 600 years of experience by the British House of Commons, quoted authorities to the effect that a departure from established procedure hampered the majority and destroyed the rights of the minority. And I myself witnessed an instance in which failure to enforce a fundamental rule of procedure at a national convention literally changed the history of the world.

Of course, a charge that the rules of the House are inadequate and a proposal to change or modify or rewrite them is always an interesting and exciting morsel for the reporters; but as Mr. Deschler, the Parliamentarian of the House, well says in his preface to the House Manual, the parliamentary practice of the House is a system of procedure that ranks second to none and meets every need.

In the fourth place, Mr. Speaker, may I call the attention of all concerned to the fact that the House and its Committee on Appropriations are operating under a Federal statute, known generally here in the Congress as the antideficiency rule. It took us several years to perfect it. But it now has teeth and is effective and we expect it to be enforced.

Formerly the departments would come before the Committee on Appropriations and submit testimony indicating that certain sums would be required to finance them through the coming fiscal year. Of course they always allow a wide margin for contingencies. And of course the committee always reduced the amount with that in view. Thereupon the department would accept the money provided and proceed to dispense it in accordance with their own ideas and when the appropriation was exhausted would come up and cheerfully inform the committee that their money was exhausted and they would have to have a supplementary appropriation or close their doors. And the committee had no choice but to pass a supplementary appropriation bill.

But under the antideficiency law, funds provided for a year's operation must be allocated by months or periods and if more than the allocation is spent for any period severe penalties are provided by the law.

In other words Congress and not the departments decides what shall be appropriated and spent and no supplementary bills are necessary except for money required by laws enacted or unforeseen contingencies arising subsequent to the enactment of the original appropriation.

We trust that all will keep in mind the policy of the committee in declining to entertain supplementary appropriation bills where the antideficiency act has been violated.

Mr. Speaker, I supplement my remarks with tables which explain the principal features of the conference report now before us, and ask unanimous consent that they be included as a part of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Summary, 1964 public works appropriations bill

Appropriation, 1963	$5,534,702,610
Budget estimate, 1964	4,561,957,000
House bill	4,276,116,400
Senate bill	4,500,963,200
Conference report	4,406,272,700
Conference total compared with:	
Appropriation, 1963	−1,128,429,910
Budget estimate, 1964	−155,684,300
House bill	+130,156,300
Senate bill	−94,690,500

On page 19 of the pamphlet print of the conference report it is indicated that $50,000 has been provided for the Cache River project in Arkansas. This is an error in printing. On page 23041 of the RECORD, the item is listed correctly. No funds have been provided for this project.

Public works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1964

SUMMARY TABLE

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL					
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES					
Salaries and expenses	$10,333,000	$10,846,000	$10,800,000	$10,800,000	$10,800,000
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL					
General investigations	18,100,000	[1] 20,060,000	18,000,000	20,600,000	19,115,000
Construction, general	792,870,500	[2] 819,486,000	798,282,700	849,856,000	827,146,500
Operation and maintenance, general	145,850,350	157,368,000	150,000,000	157,368,000	154,000,000
General expenses	14,165,200	15,252,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	73,504,000	74,860,000	74,500,000	80,406,000	77,862,000
U.S. section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers	20,000			10,000	10,000
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control	1,044,510,050	1,087,026,000	1,055,782,700	1,123,240,000	1,093,133,500
THE PANAMA CANAL					
Canal Zone Government:					
Operating expenses	23,405,650	26,465,000	25,000,000	25,725,000	25,725,000
Capital outlay	3,120,000	[3] 7,250,000	6,500,000	7,250,000	6,500,000
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses	(8,284,000)	(9,550,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,285,000)	(9,285,000)
Total, the Panama Canal	26,525,650	33,715,000	31,500,000	32,975,000	32,225,000
Total, title I	1,081,368,700	1,131,587,000	1,098,082,700	1,167,015,000	1,136,158,500
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION					
General investigations	[4] 8,632,750	11,361,000	9,894,000	10,442,000	10,294,000
Construction and rehabilitation	[5] 163,518,000	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000	185,431,000
Operation and maintenance	[6] 35,845,530	38,588,000	38,000,000	38,000,000	38,000,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(3,525,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)
Loan program	[6] 12,217,000	[7] 13,300,000	12,217,000	12,367,000	12,367,000
Emergency fund	1,000,000				
Upper Colorado River Basin Fund	[6] 111,808,000	[8] 101,287,000	97,845,700	97,989,200	97,989,200
General administrative expenses	[9] $9,666,320	$10,051,000	$10,000,000	$10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	342,687,600	370,347,000	348,146,700	356,223,200	354,081,200
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Construction	29,800,000	[10] 56,058,000	36,000,000	36,204,000	36,204,000
Operation and maintenance	13,126,250	13,929,000	13,200,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	42,926,250	69,987,000	49,200,000	49,704,000	49,704,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Operation and maintenance	800,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000

See footnotes at end of table.

Public works appropriation bill, fiscal year 1964—Continued

SUMMARY TABLE

Item	Appropriations, 1963	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR—Continued					
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION					
Construction	$7,210,000	$3,520,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000	$3,000,000
Operation and maintenance	1,479,450	1,568,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(5,000,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	8,689,450	5,088,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Total, definite appropriations	395,103,300	446,422,000	402,846,700	411,427,200	409,285,200
Total, indefinite appropriations	8,525,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000
Total, title II	403,628,300	455,285,000	411,709,700	420,290,200	418,148,200
TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION					
Operating expenses	2,872,224,000	[11] 2,423,500,000	2,308,169,000	2,369,524,000	2,342,669,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(29,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)
Plant and capital equipment	262,745,000	[12] 426,145,000	380,000,000	418,695,000	400,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	3,134,969,000	2,849,645,000	2,688,169,000	2,788,219,000	2,742,669,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses	(424,450)	(429,000)	(429,000)	(429,000)	(429,000)
Tennessee Valley Authority	35,071,000	[13] 48,284,000	46,000,000	48,284,000	47,142,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:					
Salaries and expenses	$33,610	$39,000	$38,000	$38,000	$38,000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	80,000	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	113,610	156,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins	552,000	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, definite appropriations	3,170,705,610	2,898,085,000	2,734,324,000	2,836,658,000	2,789,966,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	29,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Total, title III	3,199,705,610	2,930,085,000	2,766,324,000	2,868,658,000	2,821,966,000
TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Public works acceleration	[14] 850,000,000	[15] 45,000,000	----------	45,000,000	30,000,000
Total, title IV	850,000,000	45,000,000	----------	45,000,000	30,000,000
Grand totals:					
Total, definite appropriations	5,497,177,610	4,521,094,000	4,235,253,400	4,460,100,200	4,365,409,700
Total, indefinite appropriations	37,525,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000
Grand total, all titles	5,534,702,610	4,561,957,000	4,276,116,400	4,500,963,200	4,406,272,700

[1] Includes $40,000 in S. Doc. 45.
[2] Reflects increase of $1,900,000 in H. Doc. 128, and $170,000 in S. Doc. 45.
[3] Reflects increase of $250,000 in H. Doc. 134.
[4] Reflects transfer of $232,750 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[5] Reflects transfer of $300,000 from "Loan program" and $700,000 from "Construction and rehabilitation" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[6] Reflects transfer of $232,750 to "General investigations" and $366,320 to "General administrative expenses" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[7] Reflects $4,000,000 decrease in H. Doc. 89.
[8] Reflects $2,622,000 decrease in H. Doc. 109 and $500,000 increase in H. Doc. 125.
[9] Reflects transfer of $366,320 from "Operation and maintenance" as provided by Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[10] Reflects decrease of $4,860,000 in H. Doc. 125.
[11] Reflects decrease of $49,300,000 in H. Doc. 105.
[12] Reflects increase of $5,945,000 in H. Doc. 166.
[13] Reflects increase of $4,000,000 in H. Doc. 125.
[14] Includes $450,000,000 appropriated in Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1963.
[15] Submitted in H. Doc. 173.

Corps of Engineers—General investigations studies to be funded with increase above House allowance reflected in conference report

NAVIGATION STUDIES

Study	Amount
Alaska:	
Hydaburg Harbor	$10,000
King Cove Harbor	10,000
California: Sacramento and Feather Rivers to Colusa and Marysville	25,000
Florida:	
Cedar Keys Harbor	7,000
Crystal River	10,000
Georgia: Chattahoochee River, Columbus to Atlanta	60,000
Hawaii:	
Explosives anchorage	10,000
Hilo Harbor lava barrier	10,000
Indiana: Michigan City Harbor	+7,600
Louisiana: Plaquemine lock	+12,000
Maine: Saco River	7,500
Maryland:	
Tilghman Island Harbor	5,000
Cuckold Creek, Neale Creek and Neale Sound to Wicomico River	10,000
Massachusetts: Pleasant Bay of Orleans	3,000
New Jersey: New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway	20,000
New York: Lake Champlain Waterway	+30,000
Oregon:	
Coos Bay, Charleston	3,000
Herman Creek	5,000
South Carolina: Cooper River	+40,000
Texas: Guadalupe-San Antonio	+10,000
Washington: Columbia River-Puget Sound Intracoastal Waterway	20,000
Wisconsin:	
Door County	10,000
Oconto River	10,000

FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES

Alabama: Warrior River and tributaries	40,000
Alaska:	
Ketchikan Creek	20,000
Nenana River	20,000
Arkansas: Saline River	30,700
California:	
Sacramento River, Chester	10,000
Wildcat and San Pablo Creeks	15,000
Florida:	
Dade County Miami area B	10,000
Waccasassa River	20,000
Georgia: Peachtree and Nancy Creeks	45,000
Hawaii:	
Waimea River	20,000
Waipio River	16,000
Illinois: Saline River	20,000
Indiana: Crooked Creek Madison	10,000
Iowa: Big Sioux River, Klondike Reservoir	+10,000
Kentucky:	
Big Sandy River	+10,000
Licking River	+20,000
Little Sandy River, Tygarts Creek	+20,000
Louisiana: Chefuncte	5,000
Minnesota: Red River, Minnesota and North Dakota	+15,000
Missouri: Spring River, Missouri and Arkansas	20,000
New Jersey: Passaic River, New Jersey and New York	40,000

Corps of Engineers—General investigations studies to be funded with increase above House allowance reflected in conference report—Continued

FLOOD CONTROL STUDIES—continued

Study	Amount
North Carolina:	
Tar River	$30,000
Yadkin-Pee Dee River, North Carolina and South Carolina	20,000
North Dakota:	
Missouri River, Bismarck and Mandan	5,000
James River, North Dakota and South Dakota	15,000
Oklahoma:	
Arkansas River Basin Water Supply, McAlester and Yale	2,000
Red River Sherwood Reservoir	+10,000
Oregon:	
Nestucca River	5,000
Tillamook Bay Streams	5,000
South Dakota: Niobrara River (Gavins Point Reservoir, sedimentation and power)	+20,000
Texas: Peytons Creek	10,000
Utah: Mill and Pack Creeks	+10,000

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to say at the outset of my remarks that I agree completely with the gentleman from Missouri, our chairman, in the remarks he has just made relative to the succession to the Presidency, and also his remarks relative to the rules of the House, and also his remarks relative to suplemental, or deficiencies, which they used to be called.

We have an antideficiency law with teeth in it and even jail sentences and dollar penalties for any agency head that expends more in a quarter than the Congress had appropriated in a general appropriation bill for that agency of Government. But they dreamed up this word "supplemental" which they use in lieu of the word "deficiency," and it has been terribly abused over the years.

I am sure that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will remember when Calvin Coolidge was the President of the United States. He served notice on every agency of Government that they had to get their appropriation dollar needs in the general appropriation bill because, Mr. Coolidge said emphatically that he would veto any deficiency bill that came to his desk unless the condition had been caused by an act of God. There were no deficiency bills presented during his Presidency except those which had been caused by an act of God. I hope President Johnson will do likewise for I would save millions even billions of our taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree that the rules of this House have proven good for the people of America. The rules under which we operate are very stringent rules, and they have not been disobeyed by the House of Representatives. The four Speakers of the House under whom I have served have demanded that the rules of the House be adhered to and adhered to strictly; and as I just said it has been good for America; that I know.

Relative to the succession to the Presidency, the facts are that there are only 537 Americans that are elected by the people. I cannot go along with anyone who says that an appointed official who has not been elected either by the people or by the House of Representatives or by the Senate to the high office he holds should be in line for the Presidency of these great United States of America.

We have a Speaker that is well able to be the President of the United States. We have a Senate President pro tempore who, even though he is quite up in years, would make a great President of the United States. Of course, I hope that nothing happens that will demand that such a condition might have to be handled, but God in his wisdom sometimes does things that we humans do not understand.

Of course, I hope the time is soon here when the Republican Party will be in power, when the American people will determine that the great Republican Party, with our great dedicated American principles, are the people that should head the Government of these United States and should control the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, relative to this bill, you will note we have reduced the President's budget to the tune of several hundred million dollars. This bill comes to the floor from the conference $1,128,439,910 below the 1963 appropriations.

So, Mr. Speaker, even though there are some items which I and the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] objected to strenuously in the conference and which should not be in this bill, but the facts are the cards were stacked against us. I can only say that as a whole this is a fair to good bill.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary to address the House, particularly you, the committee chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and other committee members to clarify a situation with additional legislative history at this time.

When the House Committee on Appropriations Report No. 902, on the public works appropriation bill, was before the

House on November 19, it contained certain language relative to the Glen Elder project in my district in Kansas. The language was:

None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes.

As you may recall, I discussed this matter at that time. My remarks included excerpts from the hearings before your committee, wherein Bureau officials testified that they proposed to purchase additional lands in fee for fish and wildlife purposes amounting to 9,167 acres above those required under the Bureau's usual acquisition policy and in fact a total increase in fee of 13,527 acres.

Recent correspondence from the Bureau of Reclamation discloses it is now contended flood control operating procedure has been revised for the Glen Elder Reservoir so as to claim that lands which were formerly desired in fee for fish and wildlife purposes are now, with the exception of 1,400 acres, to be classed as flood control lands and to be acquired in fee. This is a patent attempt to evade the congressional restriction on the purchase in fee of lands for fish and wildlife purposes simply by changing the designation of land use and all done without notice to anyone, including your committee.

I am positive the Committee on Appropriations will not sanction such an obvious scheme to circumvent the restriction imposed by the committee.

I incorporate herein, by reference, the remarks on November 19, a letter from the Bureau of Reclamation of December 5, my letter to Senator FRANK CARLSON and his remarks which appeared in the December 9 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, followed by another letter dated December 10, from Acting Commissioner William I. Palmer, and finally excerpts of comments provided me by a Bureau official earlier this year, on or about May 10, 1963.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., December 5, 1963.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOLE: This will confirm and amplify the telephone conversations of December 4, 1963, between members of our respective staffs, concerning the Glen Elder unit, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, particularly as to how the unit would be affected by the following item appearing on page 48 of the House Appropriations Committee Report No. 902, dated November 15, 1963, on the public works appropriation bill, 1964 (H.R. 9140):

"Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes."

A question has been raised as to the significance of the foregoing language in terms of acres of land involved and the probable estimated savings to the Federal Government. We informally advised you on November 20, 1963, to the effect that current estimates indicate approximately 1,400 acres of land to be precluded from purchase in fee because of the cited language.

It has since been called to our attention that this is a considerably smaller amount than you had previously been given reason to believe would be the case, and that you have publicly cited larger acreage amounts. We regret that a misunderstanding has occurred concerning this matter, and offer the following discussion of the problem.

On a number of occasions within the past 6 months we have discussed right-of-way requirements for the Glen Elder unit from the standpoint of lands needed for conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources. You were fully briefed on current Department of the Interior land acquisition policies which generally require that lands below the maximum water surface elevation of a reservoir be acquired in fee as distinct from purchase of easements to seep and flood. Application of this procedure had the effect of increasing the fee acquisition of reservoir lands by several thousand acres—many times the above-cited amount of 1,400 acres.

Such misunderstanding as now exists evolves from our failure to acquaint you with a change in the flood control operating concept for the Glen Elder unit which has the practical effect of requiring that the lands in the flood control pool of the reservoir be acquired in fee. Briefly, this change which occurred late this summer provides that Waconda Lake, the reservoir to be created by Glen Elder Dam, would be used as a holdover reservoir for storage of floodwaters pending evacuation of other reservoirs in the Kansas River system. This change in operating concept would require some changes in engineering design of levees and embankments, the cost of which is fully covered by increased flood control benefits arising from the revised operating plan.

As this plan involves retention of floodwater in storage for extended periods, perhaps months at a time, it seems plausible to assume that this fact alone justifies and requires that the lands thus inundated be acquired in fee. Following this logic, we must conclude that the reason for purchase of fee title to lands within the flood control pool is no longer exclusively for fish and wildlife conservation, but is more accurately described as being for flood control purposes.

In summary, only 1,400 acres of the designated taking for right-of-way for Waconda Lake would have a single-purpose fish and wildlife use and thus be clearly precluded from acquisition by the cited action of the committee. The increased taking over previous estimates is occasioned by the revised flood control operating criteria.

We are pleased to submit this explanation and relterate our regret for any embarrassment you may have felt due to our failure to communicate the changing situation surrounding the Glen Elder unit.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM I. PALMER,
Acting Commissioner.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1963.

Re Glen Elder unit.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The committee report (p. 48) accompanying H.R. 9140, the public works appropriations bill for 1964, contains the following language: "None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes." I requested this language, as there were plans to acquire 13,527 acres in consideration of fish and wildlife resource planning, some to be acquired in fee and some covered by flowage easements. This is attributed to a revised interdepartmental policy agreed upon by the Secretary of Interior and Secretary of the Army in February 1962.

Frankly, I could see no reason for removing this much acreage from local tax rolls, nor devoting this much acreage for fish and wildlife purposes. I would point out that those persons affected are not opposed to negotiating an easement in most instances, but do oppose the land being taken in fee.

At any rate, I felt inclusion of the above language in the report, along with my statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 21177, November 19, 1963, would clarify any question which might arise; and just as an additional precaution I directed a question to Congressman CANNON, and he affirmed my position that none of the land in the Glen Elder project would be taken in fee for fish and wildlife purposes.

On Tuesday of this week I asked Bill Kats to make certain the Bureau of Reclamation was in accord with what I still consider to be the proper interpretation of the legislative history. In his discussions with Mr. Casey and Mr. Palmer of the Bureau of Reclamation, he was advised of many things, including a statement by Mr. Casey that still another revision in policy had been made late this summer; hence, all the land I had referred to except 1,400 acres would now be needed in fee for flood control. In other words, simply by changing the designation of what the acreage would be used for, my efforts had been completely circumvented.

So you may be fully informed, I am enclosing and attaching hereto copy of a statement prepared earlier this year which contains the following: "From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres." Also attached is a copy of the report containing the language I have referred to on page 48, a copy of my comments in the RECORD, and a letter signed by William I. Palmer, Acting Commissioner, dated Decem-

ber 5, which, in my opinion, is a weak attempt to avoid the clear intent of my efforts.

Let me make it clear there is no misunderstanding on my part, but because of the interpretation contained in Mr. Palmer's letter, it would be appreciated if you would make additional legislative history when the Senate bill is debated on the floor. If this is not feasible, I certainly intend to do whatever may be necessary to clarify the unwarranted interpretation when the bill goes to conference.

Sincerely yours,

BOB DOLE.

Senator CARLSON. On page 48 of the report the following is set forth:

"Missouri Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes."

I wish to comment briefly on that point, because I hold in my hand a letter from Representative ROBERT DOLE, who represents that district in the House of Representatives. In his letter he expresses some concern in regard to possible changes in the plans in regard to the fish and wildlife area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, in addition to the statement I have read, which is a part of the committee report, because I, too, share the same feeling in regard to the land purchased in fee simple for this project.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
Washington, D.C., December 10, 1963.

Hon. BOB DOLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DOLE: This will respond to your telephone request of December 10, 1963, in further regard to the following language which appears in the report from the House Committee on Appropriations on the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1964:

"Missouri River Basin project, Glen Elder unit, Kansas: None of the funds provided for the Glen Elder project are to be used to purchase in fee above the normal maximum reservoir water level, for fish and wildlife purposes."

It would be our view that the foregoing language would not preclude the acquisition of fee title to lands that are required for other water resource purposes such as flood control. Furthermore, if the limitation were amended so as to preclude the acquisition of such fee title for lands required for flood control purposes, it possibly would have the effect of preventing construction of the dam and reservoir.

As further pointed out in our conversation, the Bureau of Reclamation will cooperate with you in every appropriate way in reducing the impact of fee title land acquisition for the Glen Elder unit on the local communnities surrounding the development.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM I. PALMER,
Acting Commissioner.

INFORMAL REPORT FURNISHED ON OR ABOUT MAY 10, 1963

In summary, the total impact of fish and wildlife land acquisition on the right-of-way requirements for this development may be illustrated as follows:

Item	Minimum program for reservoir	Wildlife management [1]	New policy
Fee title	$20,213	$24,573	$33,740
Easement	14,925	12,605	7,470
Total	35,138	37,178	41,210

[1] This is the plan approved by the Commissioner of Reclamation and which was presented to the Congress in support of initial construction funds.

From the foregoing, it can be seen that considerations of fish and wildlife resource planning involve an increase in lands to be acquired in fee title by 13,527 acres; however, 7,465 acres of these lands would have been covered by flowage or construction easements.

In conclusion, I am attempting to save taxpayers between $2 and $3 million and eliminate some of the land to be purchased in fee for no apparent good reason. This project is in my district, so no other Member is affected. In effect, Bureau of Reclamation officials by changing the stated use or designation of this acreage, completely circumvented the intent of the committee, my intent committee. To me this action is a flagrant disregard of efforts of the legislatve branch. What does one need to do to impress upon those responsible for this attempt to completely ignore specific language in a committee report along with extensive legislative history? I can assure the House that if there should be further misinterpretation and misconstruction it will be called to the attention of the committee.

I would add a note of disappointment that funds for the project programed for irrigation features in the Almena unit, Norton County, Kans., were eliminated in the conference. It is hoped this can be rectified next year and that the Commissioner of Reclamation will urge appropriation of the funds necessary to conclude this project.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I commend the gentleman for his remarks. I know the cards were stacked against him in his efforts to hold the bill to the original House figures. Is it not true that this bill is some $260 million more than was approved by the House of Representatives?

Mr. JENSEN. No, it is not that much. It is $130,156,300 more than was approved by the House originally.

Mr. GROSS. It is 130 and some hundred thousand dollars more?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. I can assure the gentleman—the increase is not the fault of the Republican Members of the conference committee.

Mr. GROSS. Is there an increase of some $30 million for the accelerated public works program?

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry to say there is. I vigorously opposed that item with all the power at my command.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As a member of this subcommittee, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Missouri, the gentleman from Iowa and the other conferees on what I would regard generally as a good job. I certainly do not agree with the $30 million for accelerated public works nor am I pleased with the fact that the House conferees were unable to uphold the position of the House regarding the Northwest Intertie. The gentleman from Iowa will recall that the position of the Committee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations in the House was that the whole matter needed a very good looking into and the language that we had in the report, indicated to the Department of the Interior that it was our preference that real bona fide negotiations looking toward possible private construction of this Intertie be entered into, and be entered into in good faith. The language shared by Senator CARLSON, as stated and, in fact, reverse their own position. Again, let me state I am positive the Committee on Appropriations will not sanction such an obvious scheme to circumvent the restriction imposed by the in the conference report adopts criteria which I think are entirely new and something that has never been adopted before, and with which I am in complete and utter disagreement as far as the construction of transmission lines is concerned. It seems to make it impossible for a private company to build lines to transport power for the Federal Government. I feel the criteria is wrong and the results will be disastrous for private enterprise. I serve notice on my colleagues right now that in the future, I will certainly do what I can to make sure that this criteria will be confined to this case alone and will not be any precedent as to future construction.

I think it is well to read at this point the language which the House Republicans would have included in the conference report, with reference to the intertie, had we been able to do so. It is as follows:

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION—WEST COAST INTERTIE

The committee recommends an appropriation of $5 million (for acquisition of land and acquisition and installation of equipment) and $1,500,000 (for preliminary engineering) to initiate construction of two extra-high-voltage transmission lines for the interconnection of the Bonneville Power Administration's system on the Columbia River and the power systems in California and the Southwest. At least one of them may connect with a non-Federal power system at the northern California border and be terminated at this point. Any line built by the Federal Government shall be self-liquidating, as shall be the portion of the line outside the Bonneville Power Administration area.

The committee directs that construction of these lines not begin until there has been enacted into law S. 1007, or similar legislation guaranteeing electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal hydroelectric plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority. In adidtion, construction shall not begin unless the Secretary of the Interior finds, after good faith negotiations with utilities and other entities interested in constructing any portion of the lines involved that their proposals will not result in benefits to the national interest at least equal to those to be derived from Federal construction; has submitted his findings to the committee; and the committee has had an opportunity to review them.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION, CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, PACIFIC COAST INTERTIE—$2 MILLION

The committee recommends an appropriation of $2 million for land acquisition, engineering, design, and initiation of construction of extra-high-voltage transmission lines for the interconnection of the power systems in California and the Southwest with the Bonneville Power Administration's power system on the Columbia River.

The requirements and restriction set forth by the committee as applicable to the extra-high-voltage interconnection for which funds are recommended for the Bonneville Power Administration shall govern use of these funds.

I thank the gentleman and say to him that he can depend on my complete cooperation and by so doing we will try our best to save at least $100 million for the American taxpayers.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. WESTLAND. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and first of all ask the gentleman from Iowa if he can give me the reasons why the House receded from the language in the House report and accepted the language in the Senate report.

Mr. JENSEN. I may say I made an attempt to substitute language of my own for the language in the Senate report but I was voted down.

Mr. WESTLAND. There was a vote on this question?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, you know, in our committee we hardly ever take a record vote. When the powers that be in that committee say, "this is it," that is it, generally speaking. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] and I were outnumbered, it is just that simple.

Mr. WESTLAND. That was my understanding.

Mr. JENSEN. There is not much a minority member can do about it. We hope the day will soon come when we Republicans will be at the wheel.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yes. I am aware of that. Let me ask the gentleman this: From what I have been able to read from the Senate language and the conference report, it would indicate if one line was to be built, it must be a Federal line. Is that correct?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right according to the language on the report.

Mr. WESTLAND. There is no opportunity, then, for construction by a non-Federal entity if only one line is to be built?

Mr. JENSEN. That is what I read and understand by the report.

Mr. WESTLAND. It would seem to me this conference report is in direct conflict, then, with the position that the House took at the time of the discussion on this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. I agree.

Mr. WESTLAND. Yet there was no debate and no vote and this matter was not battled, you might say, by the majority side of the conferees in favor of the House position?

Mr. JENSEN. The Senate language seemed to be very pleasing to the majority members of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WESTLAND. Is it correct to say that the majority members of the House conferees did not try to uphold the House position on this language?

Mr. JENSEN. I think that can be said honestly.

Mr. WESTLAND. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

(Mr. WEAVER (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 9140, the civil functions appropriation bill.

The 24th Pennsylvania Congressional District has an important stake in this legislation.

This bill includes funds for much needed flood control installation now being constructed on the Shenango River near Mercer, Pa. The amount earmarked for continuing work on the Shenango Reservoir is $10,800,000.

The report also contains $150,000 for planning for a flood control installation on French Creek near Union City, Pa.

Both projects when they become a reality will not only have a beneficial effect in the 24th District, but on the Ohio River Basin which encompasses the Shenango and the Alleghany River Basin-French Creek waterways.

The people in Sharon, Pa., along the Shenango, and Meadville along French Creek, have suffered devastating floods, disrupting their economies and creating personal hardships on many families.

As long as a flood threat remains, these communities are handicapped in industrial development. The district already suffers from severe unemployment. The elimination of the flood hazard will encourage existing industry to expand and new industry to develop. This is an area with a labor market of highly skilled workers.

These flood projects are vitally needed. Any delay will subject the residents in those communities to additional hardships. The U.S. Corps of Engineers has set a timetable of construction for both projects. So that this

timetable is not interrupted I respectfully urge the support of the House for H.R. 9140.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MOSHER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 9140, the civil functions appropriation bill, containing funds for two very important flood control projects in my district: the Allegheny Reservoir and the Curwensville Reservoir.

The appropriation for the Allegheny Reservoir will permit this project to move ahead, if—and it is my hope—this House will very soon act on the conference report on H.R. 8667, the river basin and flood control project authorizations bill that will raise the ceilings on various river basins projects and allow the funds to be spent.

It is vitally important that work continue to bring this project to completion. A partially finished dam carries more potential for dangerous floods than no dam at all. Therefore, though I am most pleased that this regular civil functions appropriation bill is close to final enactment, I take this opportunity to urge early action on the conference report on the river basins authorization bill.

The $6,800,000 included in this conference report for the Curwensville Reservoir is also encouraging. Like the Allegheny, it offers two chief benefits—flood control and recreation.

Our most valuable resource is water which these two dams will conserve. We are in need of water for domestic consumption and the development of industry and the sooner we can complete these projects the closer we will be to solving some of our problems.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSENTHAL). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 86, noes 18.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 328, nays 47, answered "present" 1, not voting 59, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—328

Abernethy	Clausen, Don H.	Gonzalez
Adair	Cleveland	Grabowski
Addabbo	Cohelan	Gray
Albert	Colmer	Green, Oreg.
Anderson	Conte	Griffin
Andrews, Ala.	Cooley	Griffiths
Andrews, N. Dak.	Corbett	Grover
Ashbrook	Corman	Gubser
Ashley	Cramer	Hagen, Calif.
Ashmore	Cunningham	Haley
Aspinall	Curtin	Hall
Auchincloss	Daddario	Halleck
Ayres	Daniels	Halpern
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Hanna
Baldwin	Dawson	Harding
Baring	Delaney	Hardy
Barrett	Dent	Harrison
Barry	Dole	Harsha
Bass	Donohue	Hawkins
Bates	Dowdy	Hays
Battin	Downing	Healey
Beckworth	Dulski	Hechler
Beermann	Dwyer	Hemphill
Bell	Edmondson	Henderson
Bennett, Fla.	Edwards	Herlong
Berry	Elliott	Hoeven
Boland	Ellsworth	Holifield
Bolling	Everett	Holland
Bolton, Frances P.	Evins	Horan
	Fallon	Horton
Bolton, Oliver P.	Farbstein	Hosmer
Brademas	Fascell	Huddleston
Bray	Feighan	Hull
Bromwell	Findley	Ichord
Brotzman	Finnegan	Jarman
Brown, Calif.	Fino	Jennings
Brown, Ohio	Fisher	Jensen
Broyhill, N.C.	Flood	Joelson
Broyhill, Va.	Flynt	Johnson, Calif.
Buckley	Fogarty	Johnson, Pa.
Burke	Forrester	Johnson, Wis.
Burkhalter	Fountain	Jonas
Burleson	Fraser	Jones, Ala.
Byrne, Pa.	Frelinghuysen	Jones, Mo.
Byrnes, Wis.	Friedel	Karsten
Cahill	Fulton, Pa.	Karth
Cameron	Fulton, Tenn.	Kastenmeier
Cannon	Fuqua	Kee
Carey	Gallagher	Keith
Casey	Gary	Keogh
Chamberlain	Gathings	Kilgore
Cheif	Giaimo	King, Calif.
Chenoweth	Gibbons	Kirwan
Clark	Gilbert	Kluczynski
	Glenn	Knox
		Kornegay
Kunkel	Passman	Sibal
Kyl	Patman	Sickles
Landrum	Patten	Sikes
Lankford	Pepper	Siler
Leggett	Perkins	Sisk
Lennon	Philbin	Skubitz
Lesinski	Pike	Slack
Libonati	Pillion	Smith, Iowa
Lindsay	Pirnie	Smith, Va.
Lloyd	Poage	Springer
Long, La.	Pool	Stafford
Long, Md.	Powell	Staggers
McCIory	Price	Steed
McDade	Pucinski	Stephens
McDowell	Purcell	Stratton
McFall	Quie	Stubblefield
McIntire	Quillen	Sullivan
Macdonald	Randall	Talcott
Madden	Reid, Ill.	Taylor
Mahon	Reid, N.Y.	Teague, Calif.
Martin, Nebr.	Reifel	Thomas
Mathias	Reuss	Thompson, N.J.
Matthews	Rhodes, Pa.	Thomson, Wis.
May	Rich	Toll
Miller, Calif.	Rielhman	Tollefson
Mills	Rivers, Alaska	Tuck
Minish	Rivers, S.C.	Tupper
Monagan	Roberts, Tex.	Tuten
Montoya	Robison	Udall
Moore	Rodino	Ullman
Moorhead	Rogers, Colo.	Utt
Morgan	Rogers, Fla.	Van Deerlin
Morris	Rooney, N.Y.	Vanik
Morrison	Rooney, Pa.	Waggonner
Morse	Rooseveit	Wallhauser
Morton	Rosenthal	Watson
Mosher	Rostenkowski	Watts
Moss	Roudebush	Weaver
Multer	Roush	Weltner
Murphy, Ill.	Roybal	Whalley
Murray	Ryan, Mich.	Wharton
Natcher	Ryan, N.Y.	White
Nedzi	St. George	Whitener
Nelsen	St Germain	Whitten
Nix	St. Onge	Wickersham
Norblad	Schadeberg	Widnall
O'Brien, N.Y.	Schneebeli	Williams
O'Hara, Ill.	Schweiker	Willis
O'Hara, Mich.	Schwengel	Wilson, Ind.
O'Konski	Secrest	Winstead
Olsen, Mont.	Selden	Wydler
Olson, Minn.	Senner	Wyman
O'Neill	Shipley	Young
Osmers	Short	Zablocki
Ostertag	Shriver	

NAYS—47

Abele	Goodell	Marsh
Alger	Gross	Meader
Arends	Gurney	Minshall
Becker	Harvey, Ind.	Pelly
Betts	Hoffman	Poff
Bow	Hutchinson	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broomfield	Johansen	Rumsfeld
Clancy	Kilburn	Saylor
Clawson, Del.	King, N.Y.	Schenck
Curtis	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Dague	Langen	Snyder
Derounian	Latta	Stinson
Derwinski	Lipscomb	Taft
Devine	McCulloch	Westland
Ford	McLoskey	Wilson, Bob
Foreman	MacGregor	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Avery

NOT VOTING—59

Abbitt	Gill	Pilcher
Belcher	Goodling	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Grant	Roberts, Ala.
Blatnik	Green, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Boggs	Hagan, Ga.	Scott
Bonner	Hansen	Shelley
Brock	Harris	Sheppard
Brooks	Harvey, Mich.	Staebler
Bruce	Hébert	Teague, Tex.
Burton	Kelly	Thompson, La.
Cederberg	McMillan	Thompson, Tex.
Celler	Mailliard	Thornberry
Collier	Martin, Calif.	Trimble
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Mass.	Van Pelt
Denton	Matsunaga	Vinson
Diggs	Michel	Wilson,
Dingell	Miller, N.Y.	Charles H.
Dorn	Milliken	Wright
Duncan	Murphy, N.Y.	Younger
Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.	

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Collier against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Van Pelt.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Bruce.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Roberts of Alabama with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Goodling.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Martin of California.

Mr. Staebler with Mr. Brock.

Mrs. Hansen with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Gill with Mr. Burton.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Teague of Texas.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Pilcher.

Mr. Rains with Mr. Trimble.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Denton.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Charles H. Wilson.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. O'Brien of Illinois.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Matsunaga.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Harris with Mr. Wright.

Mr. Hagan of Georgia with Mr. Scott.

Mr. ARENDS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate, amendment No. 5: Page 6, line 4, insert the following:

"UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

"For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: Page 16, line 23, after the word "law" insert the following: "*Provided*, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2(c) of the Act of June of June 17, 1944, and sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALLS

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 231 and 232 I am recorded as not being present. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and the Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 583 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8720) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]; and, pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 583 provides for consideration of H.R. 8720, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

The record for the first 12 months of operation of the Manpower Development and Training Act is an unqualified success. It is now clear that the target set by Congress for the 3-year program of approximately 400,000 unemployed workers retrained and placed in productive employment will be achieved. This success comes at a time when the need for retraining may be growing far beyond the level originally expected.

H.R. 8720 would waive the State matching requirement for fiscal 1965 and extend the act for 2 additional years with the requirement that States match one-third and one-half, respectively, in fiscal years 1966 and 1967. It authorizes training in education at the basic level for those unable to qualify for occupational training provided evidence exists of intention to undertake such training and for this group an additional 20 weeks of training allowances are authorized. It provides for the expansion of the youth training program by lowering the age limit for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, subject to a restriction of a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts, by increasing the proportion of youth receiving training allowances to 25 percent of those receiving allowances and restricts the youth training allowances to those in special youth training projects. For these changes one-half of the President's request for new funds, $50 million, is authorized for fiscal 1964 and the full request, $100 million, is authorized for fiscal 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 583.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

(Mr. LINDSAY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time. I take the time to ask a question of the majority leadership, if the leadership is here on the floor, as to what happened to the indigent dependents bill. This is a most important piece of legislation. The rule was approved yesterday and we expected to debate it today. We are prepared to debate it. I do not mind any personal inconvenience, although I canceled some engagements late this afternoon because of this bill and the length of the calendar. But it is an inconvenience to the country, to the courts, and to the American bar.

This is a bill that I advised the bar associations in my community—and I think others did the same—would be discussed in the House today and voted on. I wonder whether I, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary who was not advised that the bill had been dropped from today's calendar, may expect the bill on the floor tomorrow, or next week or next year, or when it will come up.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that before the day is over, if the majority leadership is not presently on the floor and if the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is not around, we can obtain an answer to this question.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How about a Saturday session to deal with the bill? The gentleman will recall there was a session last Saturday and for a lesser reason.

Mr. LINDSAY. I think it is a bill that we ought to proceed with as fast as possible. It is a bill that is important to the entire country. It has to do with the defense of indigents who are rightly or wrongly accused of crime. It was reported out of the Judiciary Committee a long time ago. We expected to debate it yesterday or today. I do not understand, nor can I agree to the delay.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I think the gentleman from New York has made a valid inquiry. The inquiry should be answered. Therefore we should bring those responsible to the floor.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 236]

Abbitt	Green, Pa.	Powell
Alger	Hanna	Rains
Bass	Hansen	Rogers, Tex.
Belcher	Harris	Scott
Blatnik	Harsha	Shelley
Boggs	Harvey, Mich.	Sheppard
Boland	Hébert	Sibal
Bolling	Kelly	Sisk
Bonner	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Brock	Lankford	Springer
Brown, Calif.	Leggett	Staebler
Burton	McMillan	Stratton
Carey	Mailliard	Teague, Calif.
Cederberg	Martin, Calif.	Teague, Tex.
Celler	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, La.
Collier	Meader	Thompson, Tex.
Cooley	Michel	Thornberry
Denton	Miller, N.Y.	Trimble
Dingell	Milliken	Ullman
Dorn	Murphy, N.Y.	Van Deerlin
Duncan	O'Brien, Ill.	Vinson
Elliott	Olson, Minn.	Wilson,
Gill	O'Neill	Charles H.
Goodling	Osmers	Wright
Grabowski	Passman	Younger
Grant	Pilcher	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] 8 additional minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, before the call of the House, we were trying to discover what had happened to the indigent defendants bill. We are prepared to talk on that bill today and pass on it. It was originally scheduled for floor debate Tuesday. Then the majority leader forced an early adournjment yesterday, Wednesday, and we were told that we would debate it and pass upon it today. I have now discovered that none of the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee were told yesterday by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that he would not call the bill up today. We heard about it through the grapevine. This is not right. The bill is an important one. Neither it nor its sponsors should be treated in this fashion. Let us get on with our job.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia, who is the author of the bill.

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman is asking a very important question with respect to the indigent defendants bill. On this side of the aisle we had no knowledge whatsoever that the bill would not be heard today. I am advised that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has indicated he will not call the bill up this week. I am not advised as to what his intentions are for next week. I do know, as the gentleman has stated, that there is a tremendous amount of interest in this legislation. If I might by way of information say to the House that this bill was reported by the Committee on the Judiciary long before the civil rights bill and it suffered as a result of the hearings on the civil rights bill to the extent that the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary was completely tied up with hearings on that bill. No report had been filed or written for as much as 2½ months. However, in consideration of the work of the Committee on the Judiciary, I did not push for the report to be filed. I am extremely disappointed that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has not called the bill up, and I would say to the gentleman as far as I have been able to ascertain from the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary others on this side, including myself, who are interested in the legislation, that none of us were advised of the decision by the chairman of the committee to delay consideration of this very important legislation.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman very much. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman made a very good point and I commend him on it. I think he made a good point the other day, and I was surprised when one of the leaders of the House said that they do not tell every Tom, Dick, and Harry what goes on. As I took a look around the House during the quorum call, it appears to me also that they do not tell the Glenns, the Elmers, Dels, Sherms, Earls, Alexandera, Thors, Hastings, Flos, Charlottes, Arches, Franks, Johns, Bills, Dons, Harolds, Stewarts, Brads, Stans, Charlies, Margarets, Hermans, Durwards, Joels, Irvings, Burts, Clarks, Ralphs, Ogdens, Mels, Als, Daves, Howards, Bens, Lous, Ollies, Freds, Peters, Pauls, Jims, Genes, Kathryns, Ogdens, Garners, Anchers, Odins, Clarences, Eds, Rosses, Walters, and Joes.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] has explained this rule. This resolution makes in order the consideration of H.R. 8720, an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

I have taken this time because I think we ought to discuss for just a moment or two, under consideration of the rule, just what this bill would do if enacted into law and also talk about some amendments that may be offered to the measure when we get into the Committee of the Whole.

The major provisions of this bill would: first, postpone the effective date of State matching requirements and extend the act.

In other words, it would not require any matching on the part of the States with Federal funds during the fiscal year 1965, when it starts next July 1, as provided in the original act.

Second, it would expand the youth training program and would reduce the age for youth training allowances from 19 to 17, with a 1-year waiting period for school dropouts; it would increase the proportion of youth receiving allowances from 5 to 25 percent, and restrict the youth training allowances to those in special youth training projects.

The training of our youth for useful work is important and appealing. Although I have not had the opportunity to study fully the impact of the compromise measure brought out as part of the conference report on the vocational education bill, it is my understanding that the vocational education bill has almost the same sort of provision for youth training. In fact there would be grave danger that two different governmental agencies would be trying to do the same thing with Federal funds. This might bring about a conflict and great misunderstanding. I believe that matter should be cleared up here in this bill or in consideration of the conference report on the vocational education bill.

Third, the bill that will be brought before us also provides for the basic education of trainees. This is a new section of the law. It was not in the previous act that is being amended. This bill would extend the period for which training allowances can be provided for another 20 weeks for those who cannot enter any occupational training because of inadequate education. This means that we are going to provide basic education for these individuals for another 20 weeks so they can absorb this training program.

Mr. Speaker, under this proposed new section of the act the extended time for the education of trainees is expected to provide a sufficient period for special training in the area of reading, writing, language skills, and arithmetic.

Fourth, this bill also increases training allowances. The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to pay a train-

TABLE I.—*Examples of high income oil operators with low effective tax rates (1960)*

Taxpayer	(1) Total economic income	(2) Reported economic income	(3) Adjusted gross income	(4) Net taxable income	(5) Federal income tax	(6) Federal income tax as percentage of total reported economic income (col. 2)
A	$4,542,447	$2,110,060	$405,376	$317,284	$166,768	7.9
B	4,020,349	2,271,723	(723,916)	(725,252)	0	0
C	2,201,278	1,707,839	454,404	240,016	142,808	8.4
D	28,716,932	26,440,776	[1] (556,626)	[2] (846,330)	0	0
E	1,522,478	1,179,248	[1] 330,645	[2] (184,992)	0	0
F	1,307,962	1,029,540	135,633	[2] 131,945	61,240	5.9

[1] After carryover of net loss.
[2] Before personal exemptions.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1964—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9140) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 11, 1963, pp. 23034–23035, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the conference report was signed by all of the Senate conferees.

All legislation is the result of compromise. In general, I believe that the Senate conferees did very well in upholding the position of the Senate. The conference report provides $4,406,272,700, which is $94,690,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; $130,156,300 above the House; $155,684,300 below the budget; and $1,128,429,910 below the appropriation for fiscal year 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a summary table explaining the action of the conferees on the various items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Summary table*

Item	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL				
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY				
CEMETERIAL EXPENSES				
Salaries and expenses	$10,846,000	$10,800,000	$10,800,000	$10,800,000
CORPS OF ENGINEERS—CIVIL				
General investigations	20,060,000	18,000,000	20,600,000	19,115,000
Construction, general	819,486,000	798,282,700	849,856,000	827,146,500
Operation and maintenance, general	157,368,000	150,000,000	157,368,000	154,000,000
General expenses	15,252,000	15,000,000	15,000,000	15,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries	74,860,000	74,500,000	80,406,000	77,862,000
U.S. Section, St. Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers			10,000	10,000
Total, rivers and harbors and flood control	1,087,026,000	1,055,782,700	1,123,240,000	1,093,133,500
THE PANAMA CANAL				
Canal Zone Government:				
Operating expenses	26,465,000	25,000,000	25,725,000	25,725,000
Capital outlay	7,250,000	6,500,000	7,250,000	6,500,000
Panama Canal Company: Limitation on general administrative expenses	(9,550,000)	(9,000,000)	(9,285,000)	(9,285,000)
Total, the Panama Canal	33,715,000	31,500,000	32,975,000	32,225,000
Total, title I	1,131,587,000	1,098,082,700	1,167,015,000	1,136,158,500
TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR				
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION				
General investigations	11,361,000	9,894,000	10,442,000	10,291,000
Construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000	185,431,000
Operation and maintenance	38,588,000	38,000,000	38,000,006	38,000,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)	(4,363,000)
Loan program	13,300,000	12,217,000	12,367,000	12,367,000
Emergency fund				
Upper Colorado River Basin Fund	101,287,000	97,845,700	97,989,200	97,989,200
General administrative expenses	10,051,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation	370,347,000	348,146,700	356,223,200	354,081,200
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Construction	56,058,006	36,000,000	36,204,000	36,204,000
Operation aud maintenance	13,929,000	13,200,000	13,500,000	13,500,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration	69,987,000	49,200,000	49,704,000	49,704,000
SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Operation and maintenance	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION				
Construction	3,520,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
Operation and maintenance	1,568,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Continuing fund (indefinite appropriation of receipts)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)	(4,500,000)
Total, Southwestern Power Administration	5,088,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Total, definite appropriations	446,422,000	402,846,700	411,427,200	409,285,200
Total, indefinite appropriations	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000	8,863,000
Total, title II	455,285,000	411,709,700	420,290,200	418,148,200

TABLE 1.—*Summary table*—Continued

Item	Budget estimate, 1964 (as amended)	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES				
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION				
Operating expenses	$2,423,500,000	$2,308,169,000	$2,369,524,000	$2,342,669,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)	(32,000,000)
Plant and capital equipment	426,145,000	380,000,000	418,695,000	400,000,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission	2,849,645,000	2,688,169,000	2,788,219,000	2,742,669,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: Limitation on administrative expenses	(429,000)	(429,000)	(429,000)	(429,000)
Tennessee Valley Authority	48,284,000	46,000,000	48,284,000	47,142,000
Delaware River Basin Commission:				
Salaries and expenses	39,000	38,000	38,000	38,000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission	117,000	117,000	117,000	117,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission	156,000	155,000	155,000	155,000
U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins	----------	----------	----------	----------
Total, definite appropriations	2,898,085,000	2,734,324,000	2,836,658,000	2,789,966,000
Total, indefinite appropriations	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000	32,000,000
Total, title III	2,930,085,000	2,766,324,000	2,868,658,000	2,821,966,000
TITLE IV—FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT				
Public works acceleration	45,000,000	----------	45,000,000	30,000,000
Total, title IV	45,000,000	----------	45,000,000	30,000,000
Grand totals:				
Total, definite appropriations	4,521,094,000	4,235,253,400	4,460,100,200	4,365,409,700
Total, indefinite appropriations	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000	40,863,000
Grand total, all titles	4,561,957,000	4,276,116,400	4,500,963,200	4,406,272,700

TITLE I—CORPS OF ENGINEERS—GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. For general investigations of the Corps of Engineers the bill provides $19,115,000, which is $1,485,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $1,115,000 above the amount allowed by the House; and $1,015,000 above the appropriation for 1963.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*General investigations*

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
1. Surveys:				
(a) Navigation studies	$1,535,000	$1,828,000	$2,500,000	$2,164,000
(b) Flood control studies	4,440,000	4,777,000	5,875,000	5,351,000
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies	350,000	375,000	400,000	400,000
(d) Comprehensive basin studies:				
Big Black River, Miss	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Big Muddy River, Ill	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
Brazos River Basin, Tex	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Colorado River, Tex	215,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
Connecticut River Basin, Conn., Mass., Vt., and N. H	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Fox River, Wis	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Genessee River Basin, N.Y. and Pa	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Grand River Basin, Mich	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
Kanawha River, W. Va., Va., and N.C	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Missouri River Basin	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Neches River, Tex	110,000	110,000	110,000	110,000
Ohio River Basin review	775,000	775,000	775,000	775,000
Pascagoula River Basin, Miss	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Pearl River Basin Miss	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Puget Sound area, Washington	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Red River below Denison Dam, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Sabine River, Tex	115,000	115,000	115,000	115,000
St. Francis River, Ark. and Mo	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
St. Johns River Basin, Maine	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
St. Joseph River Basin, Mich. and Ind	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Susquehanna River Basin, N.Y., Pa., and Md	330,000	330,000	330,000	330,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Wabash River, Ind. and Ill	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
White River Basin, Ark. and Mo	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Willamette River Basin, Oreg	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
(e) Special Studies:				
Arkansas River pumped storage, Arkansas	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Arkansas-Red River pollution study, Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Arkansas, and Louisiana	50,000	50,000	200,000	125,000
Coordination studies with other agencies (Public Law 566, Public Law 984, etc.)	300,000	30,0000	300,000	300,000
Great Lakes water levels	40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000
Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway, N.Y	200,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Hurricane studies	387,000	387,000	387,000	387,000
Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y	200,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Rampart Canyon, Alaska	197,000	197,000	197,000	197,000
San Francisco Bay area survey, California	90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000
Texas coast	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Hudson River siltation study	----------	----------	55,000	55,000
General reduction applied against basin surveys	----------	−1,000,000	−1,500,000	−1,500,000
Subtotal surveys	13,234,000	12,989,000	14,489,000	13,554,000

TABLE 2.—*General investigations*—Continued

Item	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
2. Collection and study of basic data:				
Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey)	$280,000	$280,000	$280,000	$280,000
Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau)	480,000	480,000	480,000	480,000
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
International water studies	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
Flood plain studies	715,000	715,000	715,000	715,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000	1,770,000
3. Research and development:				
Beach erosion development studies	820,000	820,000	820,000	820,000
Hydrologic studies	185,000	185,000	185,000	185,000
Engineering studies	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000	1,365,000
Plan formulation and evaluation studies	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Mississippi Basin model:				
(1) Construction	461,000	461,000	461,000	461,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000
Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction	1,915,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, research and development	5,056,000	4,341,000	4,341,000	4,341,000
General reduction due to slippage		−1,100,000		−550,000
Total, general investigations	20,060,000	18,000,000	20,600,000	19,115,000

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

Mr. ELLENDER. For construction, general, the conference bill provides $827,146,500 which is $22,709,500 below the amount approved by the Senate; $28,863,800 above the House; and $34,276,000 above the 1963 appropriation.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As I stated earlier this week, when the bill was before the Senate, the House added some new unbudgeted items, which upon review by the Senate committee proved to be desirable projects, and the committee recommended approval of their inclusion in the bill. The Senate concurred in that recommendation.

The House added 17 new planning starts, which were subsequently approved by the Senate. The Senate added 28 new planning starts, and the House approved 20 of these additional planning items approved by the Senate.

The House added 19 new construction starts involving a future commitment of $89,560,000. These projects were accepted by the Senate. The Senate added 23 additional construction starts. The House accepted 15 of the new starts added by the Senate having a future commitment of $20,953,000. The budget provided for 34 new starts having a future commitment of $365,483,000. Thus the conference bill provides for 68 new construction starts involving a future commitment of $475,996,000, or about 6 months work at the current rate of appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the details of the amount allowed for this itme.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Alabama:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Holt lock and dam	$7,700,000		$7,700,000		$7,700,000		$7,700,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam		$250,000		$250,000		$250,000		$250,000
(MP)	Millers Ferry lock and dam	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	Mobile Harbor 40-foot channel	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Paint Rock River	231,000		231,000		231,000		231,000	
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss.						225,000		
(MP)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam (National wildlife refuge lands, Alabama and Georgia)	500,000				500,000		500,000	
	West Point Dam, Ala. and Ga. (See Georgia.)								
	Alaska:								
(N)	Sitka Harbor—Crescent Bay Basin					921,000		921,000	
(MP)	Snettishan power project		225,000		225,000		300,000		225,000
	Arizona:								
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Gila River downstream from Painted Rock Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Tucson diversion channel	1,750,000		1,750,000		1,750,000		1,750,000	
	Arkansas:								
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	10,300,000		10,300,000		10,300,000		10,300,000	
(MP)	Bull Shoals Reservoir, additions of units Nos. 7 and 8 Arkansas and Missouri	567,000		567,000		567,000		567,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	
(FC)	De Queen Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(MP)	Degray Reservoir	2,350,000		2,350,000		2,350,000		2,350,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Garland City					250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Gillam Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	2,917,000		2,917,000		2,917,000		2,917,000	
(FC)	Maniece Bayou, upstream extension			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	McKinney Bayou upstream extension, Arkansas and Texas						44,000		44,000
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	15,600,000		15,600,000		15,600,000		15,600,000	
(MP)	Narrows Dam, addition of 3d power unit	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(N)	Quachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,300,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Ozark lock and dam		285,000		285,000		285,000		285,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Village Creek, White River, and Mayberry Levee Districts						75,000		37,500

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	California:								
(FC)	Alameda Creek		$250,000		$250,000		$250,000		$250,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	$600,000		$600,000		$600,000		$600,000	
(FC)	Buchanan Reservoir				125,000		125,000		125,000
(FC)	Camanche Reservoir	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Corte Madera Creek						20,000		20,000
(R)	Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Dana Point Harbor				95,000		95,000		95,000
(FC)	Dry Creek Reservoir and channel improvement		150,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	610,000		610,000		610,000		610,000	
(N)	Marina Del Rey (Playa) Harbor	1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000		1,350,000	
	Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev. (See Nevada.)								
(FC)	Merced River Reservoirs		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Mormon Slough						50,000		50,000
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000		2,250,000	
(MP)	New Melones Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	8,000,000		4,555,000		4,555,000		4,555,000	
(N)	Redondo Beach King Harbor	950,000		950,000		950,000		950,000	
(N)	Redwood City Harbor			660,000		660,000		660,000	
(FC)	Redwood Creek		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	335,000		335,000		335,000		335,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	1,500,000		70,000		1,500,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project	900,000		840,000		900,000		840,000	
(N)	Santa Barbara Harbor						50,000		
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor (sand bypassing plant)	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC)	Tahchevak Creek			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(BE)	Ventura Pierpont Area (reimbursement)	122,000		122,000		122,000		122,000	
(FC)	Walnut Creek	100,000		500,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	West Fork Reservoir		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
	Colorado:								
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		86,000		86,000	300,000	86,000		86,000
	Connecticut:								
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(R)	Connecticut River below Hartford (revetments)		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(N)	Connecticut River below Hartfore, North Cove at Old Saybrook					578,000			
(FC)	East Braneh Reservoir	685,000		685,000		685,000		685,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	New London Barrier						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(BE)	Silver Beach to Cedar Beach (reimbursement)	32,000		32,000		32,000		32,000	
(FC)	Stamford	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Sucker Brook Reservoir		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
	Delaware:								
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(R)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (dikes)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	831,000		831,000		831,000		831,000	
(N)	Inland Waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	11,000,000		11,000,000		12,000,000		11,000,000	
	Florida:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Apalachicola River channel improvement	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Bakers Haulover Inlet	204,000		204,000		250,000		250,000	
(N)	Canaveral Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	14,000,000		14,000,000		15,500,000		14,750,000	
(N)	Cross Florida barge canal	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Intercoastal Waterway:								
	(a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	950,000		950,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
	(b) Jacksonville to Miami	2,085,000		2,085,000		2,085,000		2,085,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	9,000		9,000		9,000		9,000	
(N)	Palm Beach Harbor					250,000		250,000	
(N)	Pensacola Harbor					299,000			
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	575,000		575,000		575,000		575,000	
	Georgia:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(MP)	Carters Dam	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(N)	Savannah Harbor, Kings Island turning basin	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Savannah River below Augusta, Ga. and S.C.			270,000		270,000		270,000	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(MP)	West Point Reservoir, Ala. and Ga.		350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000
	Hawaii:								
(N)	Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000
(R)	Kahului Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Kaunakakai Harbor						100,000		100,000
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	766,000		766,000		766,000		766,000	
	Idaho:								
(FC)	Boise Valley	409,000		409,000		409,000		409,000	
(MP)	Dworshak (Bruces Eddy) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Ririe Reservoir		375,000		375,000		375,000		375,000

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Illinois:								
(BA)	Calumet River, bridges	$1,400,000		$1,400,000		$1,400,000		$1,400,000	
(N)	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind.:								
	(a) 27-foot depth in river channel and Lake Calumet (1962 act)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	5,700,000		5,700,000		5,900,000		5,700,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Chicago Harbor—1962 act						$27,000		$27,000
(FC)	Clear Lake Special Drainage District		$51,000		$51,000		51,000		51,000
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Freeport		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Illinois Waterway Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois. (See Indiana.)								
(N)	Kaskaskia River		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Levee Unit No. 6, Wabash River (deferred)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(FC)	McGee Creek Drainage and Levee District		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(N)	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.								
	(a) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Mount Carmel	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Rend Lake Reservoir		501,000		501,000	10,000	501,000		501,000
(FC)	Richland Creek		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff Levee					150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sid Simpson flood control project (Beardstown)	695,000		695,000		695,000		695,000	
(FC)	Sny Island Levee Drainage District		166,000		166,000		166,000		166,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Tri-Pond levee					300,000		300,000	
	Indiana:								
(FC)	Brookville Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
	Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N)	Canneiton locks and dam, Indiana and Ketnucky	9,871,000		9,871,000		9,871,000		9,871,000	
(FC)	Evansville	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Huntington Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag modification, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana. (See Illinois.)								
(FC)	Island levee, Indiana and Illinois						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Levee unit 5, Wabash River	825,000		825,000		1,000,000		825,000	
(FC)	Mason J. Nibiack levee	650,000		650,000		750,000		650,000	
	McAlpine lock and dam, Iudiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC)	Mississinewa Reservoir	5,100,000		51,00,000		5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Monroe Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
(N)	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Salamonie Reservoir	3,520,000		3,520,000		4,000,000		3,520,000	
(N)	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000	750,000	200,000		200,000
	Iowa:								
	Chariton River, Iowa and Missouri. (See Missouri.)								
(FC)	Coralville Reservoir, Mehaffey Bridge			150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Dubuque				35,000		35,000		35,000
(FC)	Floyd River and tributaries	3,800,000		3,722,000		3,722,000		3,722,000	
(FC)	Indian Creek Dam		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Iowa River-Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Little Sioux River	1,148,000		1,148,000		1,148,000		1,148,000	
(FC)	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(N)	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
	(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
	(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
	(c) Kansas City to the mouth	2,700,000		2,700,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louisa County Drainage District No. 13	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Rathbun Reservoir			400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Red Rock Reservoir	11,200,000		11,200,000		11,200,000		11,200,000	
(FC)	Saylorville Reservoir			400,000		400,000		400,000	
	Kansas:								
(FC)	Atchison		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Big Hill Reservoir						35,000		35,000
(FC)	Clinton Reservoir		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(FC)	Council Grove Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(FC)	Dodge City		185,000		185,000		185,000		185,000
(FC)	Elk City Reservoir	5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000		5,600,000	
(FC)	John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo	580,000		580,000		580,000		580,000	
(FC)	Kansas City, Kans. (1962 modification)						50,000		
(FC)	Marion Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Melvern Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Merriam						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Milford Reservoir	14,925,000		14,925,000		14,925,000		14,925,000	
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Osawatomie		39,000		39,000		39,000		39,000
(FC)	Perry Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Pomona Reservoir	1,887,000		1,887,000		1,887,000		1,887,000	
(FC)	Topeka	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Wilson Reservoir	6,600,000		6,600,000		6,600,000		6,600,000	

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Kentucky:								
(MP)	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn	$27,000,000		$27,000,000		$27,000,000		$27,000,000	
(FC)	Barren River Reservoir	7,067,000		7,067,000		7,067,000		7,067,000	
	Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(N)	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	9,200,000		9,200,000		10,000,000		9,200,000	
(FC)	Carr Fork Reservoir		$320,000		$150,000		$250,000		$250,000
(FC)	Cave Run Reservoir		220,000		220,000		220,000		220,000
(MP)	Celina Dam (deferred)		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Corbin	270,000		270,000		270,000		270,000	
(FC)	Cumberland		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC)	Eagle Creek Reservoir						100,000		100,000
(FC)	Fishtrap Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Grayson Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Green River Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(N)	McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	4,220,000		4,220,000		4,220,000		4,220,000	
	Newburgh locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC)	Red River Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
	Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
	Louisiana:								
(N)	Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Bayou Lafourche and Lafourche jump waterway	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River and Pass	4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000	
(N)	Calcasieu River, saltwater barrier		103,000		103,000	47,000	103,000	47,000	103,000
(FC)	Campti Clarence levee		23,000		23,000	100,000	23,000	100,000	23,000
(N)	Freshwater Bayou	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Mississippi River, gulf outlet	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC)	New Orleans to Venice hurricane protection (1962 act)	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)								
	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Twelve Mile Bayou					[1] (258,000)		[1] (258,000)	
	Maine:								
(N)	Narragaugus River			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Portland Harbor, 45-foot channel	2,000,000		[2] 1,000,000		2,000,000		1,500,000	
	Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H. (See New Hampshire.)								
(N)	Searsport Harbor (1962 act)	718,000		718,000		718,000		718,000	
	Maryland:								
(N)	Baltimore Harbor and Channel	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(FC)	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md. (C. & D. Canal), part II. (See Delaware.)								
	Massachusetts:								
(N)	Boston Harbor, Chelsea River				40,000		40,000		40,000
(R)	Cape Cod Canal, Bourne Bridge	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Chicopee Falls	1,385,000		1,385,000		1,385,000		1,385,000	
(FC)	Conant Brook Reservoir	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	Gloucester Harbor			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Littleville Reservoir	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(FC)	New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet Barrier	3,634,000		3,634,000		3,634,000		3,634,000	
(N)	Plymouth Harbor (1962 act)				35,000		35,000		35,000
(BE)	Plymouth Town Beach (reimbursement)	7,000		7,000		7,000		7,000	
(FC)	Three Rivers	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Wareham-Marion		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Westfield		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
	Michigan:								
(R)	Charlevoix Harbor (piers and revetments)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel	1,485,000		1,485,000		1,485,000		1,485,000	
(N)	Gladstone Harbor					200,000		200,000	
(N)	Great Lakes connecting channels	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(R)	Ludington Harbor (north revetment)	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(R)	Manistee Harbor (pier and revetment)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	Menominee Harbor, Mich. and Wis. (See Wisconsin.)								
(N)	Muskegon Harbor		18,000	100,000		100,000		100,000	
(R)	Muskegon Harbor (breakwaters, piers, and revetments)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	Ontonagon Harbor						75,000		
(FC)	Rouge River		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(N)	St. Marys River: New Poe lock	242,000		242,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Saginaw River (flood control)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
	Minnesota:								
(N)	Duluth Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis.:								
	(a) Inner harbor, 27- and 23-foot channels	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	(b) Outer harbor, 32- to 27-foot channels	1,162,000		1,162,000		1,162,000		1,162,000	
(FC)	Marshall, Redwood River	696,000		696,000		696,000		696,000	
(R)	Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River, Winnibigoshish Dam (repair apron and cutoff walls)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	St. Paul and South St. Paul	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Winona	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
	Mississippi:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Jackson and East Jackson	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC)	Natchez					115,000		115,000	
(FC)	Okatibbee Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Pascagoula Harbor	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)								

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Missouri:								
	Bull Shoals Reservoir (units 7 and 8), Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Canton	$300,000		$300,000		$300,000		$300,000	
(FC)	Chariton River, Iowa and Mo			400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Cape Girardeau and vicinity, reach No. 2 only	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Gregory Drainage District		$50,000		$50,000		$50,000		$50,000
(FC)	Hannibal		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(MP)	Joanna Reservoir		300,000		350,000		350,000		350,000
	Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir		650,000		650,000	350,000	650,000		650,000
(MP)	Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construction	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo. (See Illinois.)								
	Missouri River agriculture levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	330,000		330,000		330,000		330,000	
(FC)	South River Drainage District	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	St. Louis	8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000		8,000,000	
(MP)	Stockton Reservoir	2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000	
(MP)	Montana: Libby Reservoir		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000
	Nebraska:								
(FC)	Clarkson					[1] (205,000)		[1] (205,000)	
(FC)	Gering Valley	650,000		650,000		650,000		600,000	
(FC)	Little Papillion Creek		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
	Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
	Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC)	Norfolk		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Salt Creek and tributaries	4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000		4,200,000	
(FC)	Nevada: Martis Creek Reservoir, Calif. and Nev						100,000		100,000
(N)	New Hampshire: Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, Maine and N.H			1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
	New Jersey:								
(R)	Cold Spring Inlet (jetties)	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N)	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (anchorages), Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania	2,200,000		2,200,000		3,000,000		2,200,000	
(R)	Manasquan River (bulkheads)	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, North Reach Channel					400,000		400,000	
(R)	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dike), New York and New Jersey	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Raritan and Sandy Hook Bays	690,000		690,000		690,000		690,000	
(MP)	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
	New Mexico:								
(FC)	Alamogordo diversion channel (1962 act)		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
(FC)	Cochiti Reservoir		308,000		308,000		308,000		308,000
(FC)	Galisteo Reservoir		220,000		220,000		220,000		220,000
(FC)	Las Cruces		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Socorro	1,235,000		1,235,000		1,235,000		1,235,000	
	New York:								
	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Buffalo Harbor:								
	(a) Outer barbor (1962 modification)			250,000		250,000		250,000	
	(b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channels	707,000		707,000		707,000		707,000	
(N)	Buttermilk Channel	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(BE)	Fire Island Inlet, Long Island	500,000		500,000		600,000		500,000	
(FC)	Fire Island Inlet to Montauk Point	2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000	
(N)	Flushing Bay and Creek (1962 act)	917,000		917,000		917,000		917,000	
(N)	Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	380,000		380,000		380,000		380,000	
(FC)	Herkimer	286,000		286,000		286,000		286,000	
(N)	Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000		5,100,000	
(FC)	Itbaca, Cayuga Inlet			300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Lackawanna	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(FC)	Lake Chatauqua and Chadakoin River		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(R)	Little Sodus Bay (piers)		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
	New York and New Jersey Channels (Shooters Island dikes), N.Y. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)								
(N)	Oswego Harbor (1962 act)				60,000		60,000		60,000
(N)	Rochester Harbor	1,025,000		1,025,000		1,025,000		1,025,000	
(FC)	Rosendale				100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Salamanca				20,000		20,000		20,000
(FC)	South Amsterdam	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
	North Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Carolina Beach, hurricane flood protection		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(BE)	Fort Macon-Atlantic Beach					54,000		54,000	
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir (not authorized)						180,000		180,000
(FC)	Swift Creek			250,000		250,000		250,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (1962 act)						135,000		135,000
	North Dakota:								
(FC)	Bowman Haley Reservoir					300,000		300,000	
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (Not authorized.)					300,000		300,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.)								

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	Ohio:								
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor 27-30-foot channels, deepen turning area	$383,000		$383,000		$383,000		$383,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	7,000,000		7,000,000		12,000,000		12,000,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir		$266,000		$266,000		$266,000		$266,000
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Caesar Creek Reservoir				75,000		75,000		75,000
	Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	Cleveland Harbor:								
	(a) Bridge replacement, widening Cuyahoga and Old Rivers (1958 act)	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
	(b) Deepen East Basin to 27-28 feet (1952 act)						27,000		27,000
(R)	Conneaut Harbor (breakwaters)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(N)	Conneaut Harbor			225,000		225,000		225,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir		216,000		216,000		216,000		216,000
(FC)	East Fork Reservoir				75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Fremont		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor	4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000		4,100,000	
(FC)	Manchester (deferred)				8,000		8,000		8,000
(FC)	North Branch Kokosing River Reservoir		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Salt Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor	1,531,000		1,531,000		1,531,000		1,531,000	
(R)	Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	370,000		370,000		370,000		370,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Toledo Harbor	6,268,000		6,268,000		6,268,000		6,268,000	
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
(N)	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia						150,000		150,000
(FC)	Youngstown, Crab Creek		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
	Oklahoma:								
	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Birch Reservoir		125,000		125,000		125,000		125,000
(MP)	Broken Bow Reservoir	3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Copan Reservoir				100,000		100,000		100,000
(MP)	Eufaula Reservoir	18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC)	Hugo Reservoir						100,000		100,000
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(MP)	Keystone Reservoir	15,500,000		15,500,000		15,500,000		15,500,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(MP)	Robert S. Kerr (Short Mountain) lock and dam	1,500,000		1,500,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(N)	Webbers Falls lock and dam		370,000		370,000		370,000		370,000
	Oregon:								
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River, 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		170,000		170,000		170,000		170,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (south jetty), Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(MP)	Cougar Reservoir	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	3,740,000		3,740,000		3,740,000		3,740,000	
(FC)	Gate Creek Reservoir						100,000		
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	11,650,000		11,650,000		11,650,000		11,650,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	57,000,000		57,000,000		57,000,000		57,000,000	
(MP)	Lost Creek Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin, channel improvement and major drainage: Shelton Ditch						10,000		10,000
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
	Pennsylvania:								
(FC)	Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	21,227,000		21,227,000		21,227,000		21,227,000	
(FC)	Beltzville Reservoir		240,000		240,000		240,000		240,000
(FC)	Bethlehem	370,000		370,000		370,000		370,000	
(FC)	Blanchard Reservoir		428,000		428,000		428,000		428,000
(FC)	Butler	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Curwensville Reservoir	6,800,000		6,800,000		6,800,000		6,800,000	
(N)	Dam 4, Monongahela River	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages, Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. (See New Jersey.)								
(FC)	Elkland	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(FC)	Latrobe		117,000		117,000		117,000		117,000
(N)	Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(FC)	Muddy Creek Reservoir						25,000		
(FC)	Raystown Reservoir				150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC)	Serantou		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	10,800,000		10,800,000		10,800,000		10,800,000	
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (See New Jersey.)								
(FC)	Turtle Creek	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Union City Reservoir		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
	Puerto Rico:								
(N)	San Juan Harbor	4,633,000		4,633,000		4,633,000		4,633,000	
	Rhode Island:								
(FC)	Fox Point Barrier	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Woonsocket	1,450,000		1,450,000		1,450,000		1,450,000	
(FC)	Narragansett pier—Hurricane barrier				50,000		50,000		50,000
(R)	Point Judith Harbor (breakwaters)	470,000		470,000		470,000		470,000	
(FC)	Point Judith—Hurricane barrier				50,000		50,000		50,000
	South Carolina:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

	Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
	South Dakota:								
(MP)	Big Bend Reservoir	$23,800,000		$23,800,000		$23,800,000		$23,800,000	
(MP)	Fort Randall Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
	Missouri River bank stabilization between Garrison and Oahe Reservoirs, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See North Dakota.)								
(MP)	Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak	5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000		5,700,000	
	Tennessee:								
	Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)								
(MP)	Cordell Hull Dam	2,400,000		4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(MP)	J. Percy Priest Reservoir	3,700,000		4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(BA)	Woodland Street Bridge, Nashville, Tenn	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Texas:								
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	Bardwell Reservoir	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000		3,700,000	
(FC)	Big Fossil Creek	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Brazos Island Harbor (jetties)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(N)	Brazos Island Harbor (bend elimination at Brownsville turning basin only) (1960 act)	†800,000		†800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000		3,900,000	
(FC)	Canyon Reservoir	3,682,000		3,682,000		3,682,000		3,682,000	
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, Clear Fork extension		$132,000		$132,000		$132,000		$132,000
(FC)	Fort Worth Floodway, West Fork extension	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Freeport and vicinity		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(R)	Galveston Harbor (jetties)	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway channel to Palacios				30,000		30,000		30,000
(N)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(R)	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor dikes	562,000		562,000		562,000		562,000	
(N)	Houston ship channel (40-foot project)	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Lake Kemp Reservoir						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Lavon Reservoir modification and channel improvement		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N)	Matagorda ship channel, 36- and 38-foot channels	7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000		7,000,000	
(FC)	North Fork Reservoir						50,000		
(FC)	Pat Mayse Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (40-foot project), Gulf of Mexico to Viola	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(R)	Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway (jetties)	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(FC)	Port Arthur and vicinity (hurricane flood protection)		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Proctor Reservoir	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
	Red River levees and bank stabilization, below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex. (See Arkansas.)								
(N)	Sabine-Neches Waterway:								
	(a) 40-foot project and channel to Echo		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
	(b) Rectification and widening (1954 act)	2,138,000		2,138,000		2,138,000		2,138,000	
(MP)	Sam Rayburn (McGee Bend) Dam	12,450,000		12,450,000		12,450,000		12,450,000	
(FC)	San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Somerville Reservoir	8,100,000		8,100,000		8,100,000		8,100,000	
(FC)	Stillhouse Hollow Dam	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
(FC)	Texas City	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	Texas City Channel (dikes)	835,000		835,000		835,000		835,000	
(FC)	Vince and Little Vince Bayous		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Waco Reservoir	8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000		8,500,000	
(N)	Wallisville Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
	Vermont:								
(R)	Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	555,000		555,000		555,000		555,000	
(FC)	Victory Reservoir (deferred)		65,000		65,000		65,000		65,000
	Virginia:								
(R)	Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (replace lock gates, Great Bridge, Va.)	620,000		620,000		620,000		620,000	
(FC)	John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC)	Norfolk	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
(FC)	North Fork of Pound Reservoir	2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000		2,100,000	
	Washington:								
(FC)	Colfax	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
	Columbia River and Lower Willamette River 35- and 40-foot projects, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(FC)	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		39,000		39,000		39,000		39,000
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam		884,000		884,000		884,000		884,000
(MP)	Lower Monumental lock and dam	23,000,000		23,000,000		23,000,000		23,000,000	
(N)	Port Townsend	598,000		598,000		598,000		598,000	
(FC)	Pullman		80,000		80,000		80,000		80,000
(FC)	Sammamish River	729,000		729,000		729,000		729,000	
(N)	Swinomish Slough			150,000		150,000		150,000	
(N)	Tacoma Harbor					150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Washougal area			100,000		100,000		100,000	
	West Virginia:								
(FC)	Barboursville					[1] (150,000)		[1] (150,000)	
(FC)	Beech Fork Reservoir						150,000		
	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
	Bloomington Reservoir, Md. and W. Va. (See Maryland.)								
(FC)	Buckhannon		73,000		73,000		73,000		73,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir		280,000		280,000	220,000	280,000		280,000
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Justice Reservoir		300,000		150,000		300,000		300,000
	Pike Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	5,058,000		5,058,000		5,058,000		5,058,000	
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	10,900,000		10,900,000		10,900,000		10,900,000	
	Willow Island lock and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								

Footnotes at end of table.

Construction, general, fiscal year 1964—Continued

Construction, general, State and project	Approved budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
Wisconsin:								
Duluth-Superior Harbors, Minn. and Wis. (See Minnesota.)								
(FC) Eau Galle River, Spring Valley	$200,000		$200,000		$200,000		$200,000	
(N) Green Bay Harbor (1962 act)						150,000		$50,000
(N) Kenosha Harbor			200,000		200,000		200,000	
(R) Kewaunee Harbor (breakwater and revetment)		$30,000		$30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Kickapoo River				50,000		50,000		50,000
(R) Menominee Harbor (piers), Mich. and Wis.	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N) Milwaukee Harbor		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(R) Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(R) Sheboygan Harbor (breakwater and pier)	188,000		188,000		188,000		188,000	
(R) Sturgeon Bay-Lake Michigan ship canal	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Wyoming:								
(FC) Jackson Hole	479,000		479,000		479,000		479,000	
Miscellaneous:								
(FC) Small projects for flood control and related purposes not requiring specific legislation	4,000,000		4,000,000		5,000,000		4,500,000	
(FC) Snagging and clearing					750,000		750,000	
(N) Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $200,000	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(BE) Small beach erosion control projects not requiring specific legislation costing up to $400,000	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
Projects deferred for restudy		(150,000)		(158,000)	(158,000)		(158,000)	
Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Small authorized projects	2,128,000		2,128,000		2,750,000		2,750,000	
Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R) Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to $400,000)	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
Employees compensation	72,000		72,000		72,000		72,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−65,000,000		−84,672,000		−65,000,000		−75,000,000	
General reduction in estimates for recreation facilities			−6,033,300				−3,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general	800,471,000 (819,486,000)	19,015,000	778,407,700 (798,282,700)	19,875,000	827,528,000 (849,856,000)	22,328,000		

[1] Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects. [2] 40-foot channel.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. ELLENDER. For Mississippi River and tributaries the conference report provides $77,862,000, which is $2,544,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $3,362,000 above the House; $3,002,000 above the budget; and $4,358,000 above the 1963 appropriation.

Unfortunately, there is an error in the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the printed conference report, House Report No. 1027. On page 19 of that report it appears that the conferees agreed on $50,000 to start construction of the Cache River project in Arkansas. This is an error. The tabulation at the bottom of page 23041 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for December 11, 1963, correctly reflects the action of the conferees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a tabulation explaining the action of the conferees on the appropriation for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1964

Projects	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1964		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
1. General investigations:								
(a) Examinations and surveys	$25,000		$25,000		$25,000		$25,000	
(b) Collection and study of basic data	85,000		85,000		85,000		85,000	
Subtotal, general investigations	110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000	
2. Construction and planning:								
Mississippi River levees	2,580,000		2,580,000		2,800,000		2,700,000	
Channel improvement	26,500,000		26,500,000		28,000,000		27,250,000	
Memphis Harbor	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
Old River control	1,225,000		1,225,000		1,225,000		1,225,000	
St. Francis Basin	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
Lower White River	850,000		850,000		850,000		850,000	
Cache River	50,000				50,000			
West Tennessee tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Wolf River and tributaries	395,000		395,000		395,000		395,000	
Lower Arkansas	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Tensas Basin:								
Boeuf and Tensas Rivers, etc	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir	58,000		58,000		58,000		58,000	
Enid Reservoir	56,000		56,000		56,000		56,000	
Arkabutla Reservoir	49,000		49,000		49,000		49,000	
Grenada Reservoir	37,000		37,000		37,000		37,000	
Greenwood	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
Main stem	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
Tributaries	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Big Sunflower River, etc	1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000		1,100,000	
Yazoo backwater	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
Bayou Cocodrie and tributaries	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
Atchafalaya Basin	7,000,000		7,000,000		8,000,000		7,500,000	
Lake Pontchartrain					182,000		182,000	
Subtotal, construction and planning	54,250,000		54,200,000		57,152,000		55,752,000	
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	−1,500,000		−1,810,000		−1,500,000		−1,500,000	
Total, construction and planning	52,750,000		52,390,000		55,652,000		54,362,000	
3. Maintenance	22,000,000		22,000,000		24,644,000		23,500,000	
Grand total	74,860,000		74,500,000		80,406,000		77,862,000	

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, with respect to title II, Bureau of Reclamation, Construction, and Rehabilitation, the conference bill provides $185,431,000 for this item, which is $1,994,000 below the amount approved by the Senate; $5,241,000 above the amount allowed by the House; $10,329,000 below the budget; and $21,913,000 above the appropriation for 1963. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the record a tabulation showing the action of the conferees on this item.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Project	Budget estimate	House allowance	Senate allowance	Conference allowance
Advance planning	$692,000	$692,000	$692,000	$692,000
Gila project, Arizona	2,855,000	2,855,000	2,855,000	2,855,000
Colorado River front and levee system, Arizona-California	4,350,000	4,550,000	4,550,000	4,550,000
Parker-Davis project, Arizona-California-Nevada	973,000	973,000	973,000	973,000
Central Valley project, California	50,445,000	48,295,000	48,295,000	48,295,000
Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colorado	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000	3,800,000
Rio Grande project, recreational facilities, New Mexico	460,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
Arbuckle project, Oklahoma	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
Norman project, Oklahoma	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
Rogue River Basin project, Talent division, Agate Dam and Reservoir, Oreg	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
The Dalles project, Western division, Oregon	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000	3,150,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon	642,000	642,000	642,000	642,000
Canadian River project, Texas	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,400,000
Weber Basin project, Utah	11,309,000	11,309,000	11,309,000	11,309,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000	1,325,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington	3,900,000	3,900,000	4,950,000	4,650,000
Spokane Valley project, Washington	600,000	600,000	600,000	600,000
Drainage and minor construction	2,432,000	2,432,000	2,432,000	2,432,000
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects	3,943,000	3,943,000	3,943,000	3,943,000
Denver office computer	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
Reclamation office building			800,000	350,000
Subtotal	129,176,000	127,066,000	128,916,000	128,166,000
Missouri River Basin project:				
Ainsworth unit, Nebraska	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000	8,100,000
Almena unit, Kansas	5,580,000	3,983,000	4,403,000	3,983,000
East Bench unit, Montana	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000	4,400,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska	1,787,000	1,787,000	1,787,000	1,787,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota	365,000	365,000	365,000	365,000
Transmission division	23,956,000	23,000,000	23,275,000	23,275,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Drainage and minor construction	2,258,000	2,258,000	2,258,000	2,258,000
Investigations	1,824,000	1,557,000	1,717,000	1,717,000
Advance planning	1,343,000	1,200,000	1,200,000	1,200,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project	78,613,000	75,650,000	76,505,000	76,085,000
Other Department of the Interior agencies	3,322,300	3,180,000	3,180,000	3,180,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project	81,935,300	78,830,000	79,685,000	79,265,000
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation	211,111,300	205,896,000	208,601,000	207,431,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays	−15,351,300	−25,706,000	−21,176,000	22,000,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation	195,760,000	180,190,000	187,425,000	185,431,000

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana is discussing the appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation. I have before me the report of the conference committee, at page 22. I notice that under the heading "Kansas," for the Almena unit, the budget estimate for fiscal year 1964, for construction, was $5,580,000, and that the conference committee allowed $3,983,000.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman if the reduction was made because the original amount included funds to be made available for the beginning of work on the irrigation project, and if the funds for the construction of the dam itself remain as proposed originally.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. While I had hoped that the bill would contain funds for the irrigation section, we are pleased that it contains funds for the construction of the dam. I assure the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that next year and in future years I shall return to ask for funds for the irrigation section as well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am hopeful that Congress will agree with the suggestion of my friend from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to title III, very little change was made by the conferees. As Senators know, that title deals with TVA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrance Seaway Development Corporation, and so forth. Very little change was made in that title.

I have already submitted to the Senate the table indicating exactly what was done as to each agency in that title.

During the consideration of the public works appropriation bill, H.R. 9140, by the Senate, I discussed the meaning of the Senate committee language on the SPA continuing fund item. This language reads as follows:

> The committee directs that no part of the continuing fund be used to purchase power or lease transmission lines which are not immediately needed for the proper and efficient operation of the Southwestern Power Administration; or to contract with a generation, transmission, or distribution cooperative organized under Federal or State law if feasibility of a Federal loan to the cooperative is dependent on a contract with the Southwestern Power Administration. The Administration should give preference in the sale of power and energy to public bodies and cooperatives, as provided by law; but it should not participate directly or indirectly in the construction of generating facilities or transmission lines to compete with private enterprise in areas where adequate power is available or will be made available within a reasonable time at reasonable rates to cooperatives and public bodies.

I stated during the discussion of the bill that in my opinion the Senate committee language is a restatement of existing law. The hearings on the bill disclosed that REA once again is looking to arrangements with the Southwestern Power Administration to provide feasibility for loans to construct power facilities. The committee, therefore, felt it necessary to restate the law and the congressional policy.

It was believed that the language might cause an adverse affect on contracting which must be done by an ordinary distribution cooperative with SPA or might be detrimental to the preference users and their right to public power as the Federal Flood Control Act intended. It was suggested that the language be further discussed in conference.

There was no intention on the part of the committee to adversely affect the operations of REA and SPA, as those operations have been authorized by the Congress. However, to make certain that the language did not affect the contracts entered into with SPA by distribution cooperatives and to make certain

that it did not affect the right of preference users to public power, the committee on the conference has restated this language. However, neither the language of the Senate report nor of the conference report authorizes or gives consent of the Congress to arrangements which make the feasibility of an REA loan dependent on contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration. This is the kind of activity which the Senate committee believes is contrary to the law.

With respect to title IV, funds appropriated to the President. The conference report provides $30 million instead of the $45 million approved by the Senate.

The conferees of both Houses agreed that except for $2 million for administration the funds appropriated should be limited to community facility type projects.

Personally, I would have preferred to have the House accept the Senate version. The House conferees felt that the Senate should have accepted the House bill. They contended that the House had sent the Senate a very good bill, as indeed it had. The Senate conferees waged a valiant fight to uphold the position of the Senate, and I believe they made an excellent showing in this respect.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish once again to salute the Senator from Louisiana for the hours and days and weeks and months that he has assiduously devoted to the problems of public works in this session of this Congress, as he has also so ably and expertly done in prior Congresses. He has performed a service not only for the people of a particular State, but also for all the people in the country. I thank him for a job that he has once again expertly done.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from California in expressing gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana and his coconferees. He has performed magnificently. It was my desire to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report, to pay our respects to the Senator from Louisiana. It would have been a unanimous vote, or close to it. However, my friend the majority leader has quite rightly said that he had given indication to Senators that there would be no yea-and-nay votes this afternoon. Therefore, I will not ask for one.

However, I wish the RECORD to show that in my opinion if there had been a yea-and-nay vote on the adoption of the conference report, it would have been practically a unanimous vote, and in no small measure it would have been an expression of our appreciation for the good work the Senator from Louisiana has done on the conference report.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Oregon. The Senate owes a debt of gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and other members of the committee, and also to the conferees from the other body, who have worked on the conference in behalf of the control of the water runoff of this Nation.

We in Kansas are particularly indebted for the interest Senators have shown in the problems of our own State, and for their knowledge of the benefits of the program.

I am convinced that the future growth, not only of Kansas, but of the entire Middle West, will be determined by the amount of water than can be conserved and used for beneficial purposes. We have made a great start in this field, and I am indebted to the Senator for the work he and his committee have done in this field.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana deserves every tribute that has been paid to him for the manner in which he has handled the pending bill. This is one of the bigger appropriation bills, and certainly one of the most important bills, although it is not as popular in some circles as some of the other appropriation bills. The Senator from Louisiana has handled the bill in a unique way, and he should be commended for the very satisfactory and effective way in which he has handled it.

I want also to pay tribute to Ken Bousquet, who is probably one of the most able staff members that we have on any of our committees. Too, I want to commend Paul Eaton who handled title II of the bill. He always does a swell job.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am certain I speak for all of my colleagues who have saluted the Senator from Louisiana in also congratulating one of the ablest and most efficient members of an excellent and efficient staff.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Words are not needed to express our wholehearted and unanimous appreciation for the outstanding work which the Senator from Louisiana has done, not only this year, but also down through the years. Every Member, regardless of party has had a fair opportunity to present his claim. All I can say is, "Amen."

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate these salutes very much. I am always vitally interested in preserving the water resources and the land resources of our country. I believe that what we are doing now will benefit generations yet unborn. I hope that I shall be in a position where I can continue to do this work. I assure my colleagues that I shall make every effort to do in the future what I have done in the past, that is, not to make provision for the conservation of resources in a particular area of our country, but for this to be done irrespective of State boundaries. I say this because it is my belief that a program of this kind must be looked at in that way if we are to succeed in doing a good overall job for the full protection of our water and land resources.

I wish again to pay my respects to the competent clerks and advisers on the committee staff, particularly to Ken Bousquet, who has been with this committee for some time, and also to Mr. Paul Eaton, who has been particularly responsible for the work on reclamation and other programs in title II of the bill. Both of these gentlemen have done yeoman work in assisting in the hearings and in the preparation of all the data that I was able to make available to the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to refer specifically to page 24 of the conference report. This item is of particular importance to the Senators and people of Oregon, the Senators and people of Washington, and the Senators and people of California.

In the Northwest, there is the Bonneville Power Administration, capable of producing a great quantity of hydroelectric power. Unfortunately, there has been a waste of the water because of the inability of the Bonneville Power Administration, to sell power. The people of California need power. It has been recommended by Senators from the Western States, by the governments of the Western States, and by the executive branch of the Government that an appropriation be made under which the Secretary of the Interior could negotiate and determine a contract to build a power line from the north to my State and beyond, which would be in the public interest.

Written into the Senate report is language that reflects the public interest and would continue the authorization to the Secretary of the Interior, on the basis of sound and solid competition, to make the best deal for the people of the United States. That language prevailed. It is a specific reason why the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and his colleagues deserve an accolade.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I shall do everything I can to help get surplus Bonneville power delivered to the people of California, for the people of California. I shall oppose any attempt to have it delivered to Pacific Power and Light or any of the other private utilities in California, because I think it ought to be delivered over a Federal transmission line. That power is generated from streams that belong to all the people of the country and should be delivered for the benefit of all the people of the country over a Federal transmission line. The language in the bill permits that kind of transmission. I thank the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana for retaining that kind of language.

I know of no issue that could be a hotter one in my State than the issue of the transmission of power, for Oregon is losing much industry to Washington, for example, which has public power transmission lines, in contrast with the domination of the economy of my State by private utilities. I do not want to aid and abet that situation any longer.

So I shall support the efforts of my good friend to put a public power transmission line into California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I will translate those comments, in which the Senator from Oregon has joined with the Senator from

California, into a joint committee on the retention of that language.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, first, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee [Mr. ELLENDER] for his helpfulness in adding two worthwhile Connecticut projects to the bill this year.

I am very much pleased that he and his fellow Senate conferees were able to keep in the bill the $50,000 for planning on the New London Barrier. This is a start, and a very important one, on a project to which the Federal Government will eventually contribute $2,431,000.

Many people in the New London area join me in expressing our gratitude and our thanks to the senior Senator from Louisiana and to the other members of the committee for their help.

The second matter to which I wish to briefly refer is not such a happy one, especially to the people in Old Saybrook and to many boat owners in the States bordering the Long Island Sound.

The Senate conferees had to recede to the House and take out of the bill the $578,000 initially approved by the Senate for the North Cove navigation project.

I realize the Senate cannot have its way on all of these public works projects, but I think it is especially regrettable that North Cove is one of the ones that was taken out of the bill. I say this because it was first authorized 18 years ago, in 1945, and because the $578,000 would have permitted both the initiation and the completion of the proposed North Cove anchorage area and channel deepening.

The Corps of Engineers has stated that, "The cove may be reasonably expected to become one of the most used harbors of refuge for small boats in the northeastern part of the Long Island Sound."

It is a good project and the people of Old Saybrook are living up to the requirements for participation in the project by the Federal Government.

Because of the soundness of the project and the support given to it in my State, I wonder if the distinguished Senator could give me any idea as to the chances of including in an appropriations bill the funds for North Cove in the near future.

I do not wish to put the Senator on the spot, but I thought it might be possible to include the $578,000 in the fiscal 1964 supplemental appropriations bill we will take up early next year. Or perhaps he could give an assurance that he will include it in the next regular public works appropriations bill, the one for fiscal 1965.

I would appreciate any help or hope he is able to offer.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of the two new projects that were proposed for Connecticut, we were able to save the one for planning the New London Barrier.

Mr. DODD. Yes; I am very grateful for that.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was impossible to persuade the House to agree to the second one, of which the Senator has just spoken. But I assure the Senator from Connecticut that we will make another try in the public works bill next year.

Mr. DODD. I am grateful for the Senator's response.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe we may succeed in doing so at that time.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS, 1964

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech on foreign aid,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make be placed in the RECORD prior to the action of the Senate on the conference report on the civil functions appropriation bill, 1964, as adopted today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY: Mr. President, under title IV—"Funds Appropriated to the President—Public Works Acceleration," the conference made the following statement:

> The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated, except for the $2 million for administration, shall be limited to community facilities type projects.

That language refers to the public works acceleration program with respect to which the conference agreed to $30 million instead of the $45 million proposed by the Senate.

That particular limitation would impose an incredible hardship upon a large number of people in the northern regions of the United States. I deeply regret that the limitation has been placed in the conference report. I hope that somehow or other it can be totally ignored, because it so happens that today the temperature is about 10° below zero in northern Minnesota. It so happens that thousands of people in that area are without jobs. It so happens that the only job that they can get in the winter is work in the forests. We desperately need that work in the forests. It may be warm in Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, or Florida, but in Minnesota, particularly in the northeastern section where our forest lands are, it is very cold.

To place the kind of limitation I have read in the conference report is cruel. In northern Minnesota in the wintertime we do not need community facilities. We cannot build them. Construction comes to a complete halt. It so happens that at Bemidji, Minn., it will be 35° to 45° below zero. At International Falls the temperature will go to from 20° to 50° below zero week after week.

The good people in that area are hard-pressed for jobs. They are the victims of seasonal unemployment in good times. For the past 5 years they have been the victims of chronic unemployment. All that those people have had in terms of help is a little assistance under the accelerated public works program for the forestry projects conducted by the U.S. Forest Service. Now the Congress has imposed a limitation which in effect states to hundreds of my people, "Starve," or "Get on relief," or "Get some food stamps and be happy."

Mr. President, I resent that. I am shocked to think that a conference committee would put such a crippling amendment upon the use of public funds for the sake of public works to help people who are desperately in need.

On an appropriation bill a conference committee has a certain amount of authority, but it does not have omnipotent authority. I hope that the President of the United States, in administering the funds, will ignore that language.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree with the Senator more. I share his resentment. The problem is not one limited to Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, it is not.

Mr. MORSE. It is a problem that affects all of us.

I have several questions I should like to ask the Senator. The language in the conference report does not have the effect of binding legislation, does it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not believe so. It is a recommendation, but it is not even in the form of a proviso. The language of the conference report is as follows:

> The conferees of both Houses are in agreement that the use of the funds appropriated * * * shall be limited to community facilities type of projects.

But there is a limitation to what an Appropriations Committee can do. I hope that that limitation will impose some restraint upon that kind of harsh language.

I know that the President of the United States is carefully examining the budget for 1964. I assure him that in any way that we can save on resources and promote better administration he has my support. But I did not come to the Senate to give my assent and consent to provisions of law relating to the welfare of the citizens of our country that for all practical purposes condemn those people to relief and deprivation. That is exactly what the conference report would do.

I do not like it. I believe it is outrageous that the money can be limited when we know full well what the needs are. I have been before the Committee on Appropriations. We have had representatives of the accelerated public works program, including the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Budget, in meetings with Senators from the Northern States. Our people are jobless. They need work. It is cold. Community facilities cannot be built in northeastern Minnesota in the middle of the winter. The accelerated public works program is designed to be of some help to people.

Mr. MORSE. It is my interpretation—and I believe the Senator from Minnesota shares it—that the language really is a statement of recommendation on the part of the Appropriations Committee to the Forest Service, but it does not have the binding effect of law.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope that will be the case. It would seem to me that, as the Senator from Oregon has explained it, it is the case. If it is not the case, I wish to redefine the term "community facilities," because in northeast Minnesota in the wintertime "community facilities" includes cutting trees.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Minnesota agree with the Senator from Oregon on the observation that if it should develop that the Forest Service would in fact be prohibited from the development of the facilities and the providing of employment in northern Minnesota——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Wisconsin, Michigan, and Oregon——

Mr. MORSE. And elsewhere, where the same need exists, the President of the United States and the agencies of our Government should take an emergency look—I should like to describe it in that way—at all the programs that call for the allocation of funds by the various departments, and recommend to the departments concerned that wherever they can hold out a helping hand to those who are unemployed, as described by the Senator from Minnesota, they should proceed forthwith to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. He is absolutely correct. Our greatest asset happens to be our forests. We can build something in those forests. We can build the kind of trails that are needed. We can clean out the forests and work in those forests. We can do constructive work that will produce dividends and money to the Federal Treasury.

Now we have received a sort of warm climate amendment. It happens that the United States does not all belong in the Torrid Zone. Some of it is in the Frigid Zone. I happen to represent a part of the United States which is cold in the wintertime. Perhaps my conferee friends would like to give us a little vacation down South so that we can have a little easier living for the winter months.

I wish to make the RECORD clear that I do not abide by that decision. I ask the President of the United States to put first the care of the people and second the budget. I am not at all sure I agree with all the things that are being done about the budget. I will get around to that subject a little later.

In the meantime, I rise to protest, in the name of humanity, decency, and compassion, a provision in the civil functions report that has no relevance to fairplay and no relevance to the consideration of the people who live in the areas of this country where it gets mighty chilly and mighty snowbound in the wintertime.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. I would not want to have the conference report adopted and action on it concluded without first expressing my deep appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues for their objective, and favorable consideration of several Alaska projects, notably the Sitka small boat harbor. I am most grateful for that action. Likewise, my gratitude extends to the House conferees, who accepted the proposal for the Sitka Harbor after it had been added by the Senator from Louisiana and the members of his subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the report was unanimously agreed to.

AGREEMENTS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL BY PASSENGER COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 736, H.R. 5179.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the bill was passed earlier today, at a time when I was unable to be present. I asked that the votes by which it was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed be reconsidered, in order that I might offer a short amendment to correct an inadvertent injustice which is contained in the law.

Under the postal law, in fixing postal rates, it is provided that a special rate may apply to not to exceed one publication published by an official highway agency of a State which meets all the regulations of section 4354 and which contains no advertising. The only State magazine that is published by a highway agency is the magazine Arizona Highways.

Vermont has an official magazine published by its development agency. Under the law enacted a year or so ago, the State of Vermont is required to pay 1 cent a pound more postage than would the State of Arizona. So I ask that the bill be amended at the proper place by inserting after the word "highway" the words "or development". The bill as thus amended would read:

> Not to exceed one publication published by the official highway agency or development agency of a State which meets all of the requirements of section 4354 and which contains no advertising.

The reason for the amendment is that the Arizona magazine is published by the highway agency, while in Vermont the magazine is published by the development agency.

Both magazines are about the same quality. I think Vermont's is a little better, but I met with some resistance when I tried to prove it. Neither magazine carries any advertising; both comply with the law in other ways.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that it will not be possible to act on the bill until the House returns it to the Senate. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at the time the bill is returned to the Senate, the colloquy which has been in progress since it was called up, inadvertently, be made a part of the RECORD, and that at that time the amendment be considered. For the information of the Senate, it is my understanding that this proposal meets with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the ranking Republican member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the other members of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Montana is agreed to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas is present. He can speak for himself.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the remarks made by the majority leader in regard to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I would be less than frank if I did not say that I visited with the Senator from Vermont regarding this amendment some time ago and assured him that I would offer the amendment in committee, when the bill was before the committee. I sincerely regret that I failed to do so. I hope the Senate will take action now. I heartily approve of the proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the explanation made by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Kansas, I am sure it is understood by all that the bill will be brought up later in the afternoon, at which time the amendment will be offered and accepted, and the bill then passed by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, it is my understanding that Calendar No. 736, H.R. 5179, and Calendar No. 737, H.R. 5778, have been returned from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the colloquy which occurred previously, I ask unanimous consent, in regard to H.R. 5179, that the Senate resume consideration of the bill and that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] may be acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5179) to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into agreements for the transportation of mail by passenger common carriers by motor vehicles; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which would add the language:

Public Law 88-257
88th Congress, H. R. 9140
December 31, 1963

An Act

77 STAT. 844.

Making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions, and for other purposes, namely: Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—CIVIL

Department of the Army

Cemeterial Expenses

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary cemeterial expenses as authorized by law, including maintenance, operation, and improvement of national cemeteries, and purchase of headstones and markers for unmarked graves; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance of that portion of Congressional Cemetery to which the United States has title, Confederate burial places under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and graves used by the Army in commercial cemeteries; $10,800,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used to repair more than a single approach road to any national cemetery: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall not be obligated for construction of a superintendent's lodge or family quarters at a cost per unit in excess of $17,000, but such limitation may be increased by such additional amounts as may be required to provide office space, public comfort rooms, or space for the storage of Government property within the same structure: *Provided further*, That reimbursement shall be made to the applicable military appropriation for the pay and allowances of any military personnel performing services primarily for the purposes of this appropriation.

Corps of Engineers—Civil

The following appropriations shall be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for authorized civil functions of the Department of the Army pertaining to rivers and harbors, flood control, beach erosion, and related purposes:

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For expenses necessary for the collection and study of basic information pertaining to river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects, and when authorized by law, surveys and studies of projects prior to authorization for construction, $19,115,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $210,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wild-

77 STAT. 845.

life Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

16 USC 661 note.

CONSTRUCTION, GENERAL

For the prosecution of river and harbor, flood control, shore protection, and related projects authorized by law; and detailed studies, and plans and specifications, of projects (including those for development with participation or under consideration for participation by States, local governments, or private groups) authorized or made eligible for selection by law (but such studies shall not constitute a commitment of the Government to construction); $827,146,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for projects not authorized by law or which are authorized by law limiting the amount to be appropriated therefor, except as may be within the limits of the amount now or hereafter authorized to be appropriated: *Provided further*, That $500,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Department of the Army.

Restriction.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, GENERAL

For expenses necessary for the preservation, operation, maintenance, and care of existing river and harbor, flood control, and related works, including such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality or other public agency, outside of harbor lines, and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation; financing the United States share of the cost of operation and maintenance of the remedial works in the Niagara River; activities of the California Debris Commission; administration of laws pertaining to preservation of navigable waters; surveys and charting of northern and northwestern lakes and connecting waters; clearing and straightening channels; removal of obstructions to navigation; and emergency flood control and shore protection activities; $154,000,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for general administration and related functions in the Office of the Chief of Engineers and offices of the Division Engineers; activities of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors and the Beach Erosion Board; commercial statistics; and miscellaneous investigations; $15,000,000.

FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

For expenses necessary for prosecuting work of flood control, and rescue work, repair, restoration, or maintenance of flood control projects threatened or destroyed by flood, as authorized by law (33 U.S.C. 702a, 702g–1), $77,862,000, to remain available until expended.

45 Stat. 534; 49 Stat. 1511.

UNITED STATES SECTION, SAINT LAWRENCE RIVER JOINT BOARD OF ENGINEERS

For necessary expenses of the United States section of the Saint Lawrence River Joint Board of Engineers, established by Executive Order 10500, dated November 4, 1953, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per day for individuals; $10,000: *Provided*, That no part of these funds shall be obligated until agreement has been entered into, by the United States Government and the United States entity authorized to construct the power works in the International Rapids section of the Saint Lawrence River, providing for the reimbursement of the expenditures of the United States section of this Board by the construction entity. 3 CFR 1949-1953, Comp., p. 978. 60 Stat. 810.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenses of attendance by military personnel at meetings in the manners authorized by section 19(b) of the Act of July 7, 1958 (72 Stat. 336), uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131), and for printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of survey reports authorized by law, and such survey reports as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress; and during the current fiscal year the revolving fund, Corps of Engineers, shall be available for purchase (not to exceed one hundred and eighty-three for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles. 5 USC 2318. 68 Stat. 1114.

The Panama Canal

Canal Zone Government

OPERATING EXPENSES

For operating expenses necessary for the Canal Zone Government, including operation of the Postal Service of the Canal Zone; hire of passenger motor vehicles; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); expenses incident to conducting hearings on the Isthmus; expenses of special training of employees of the Canal Zone Government as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2301 et seq.); contingencies of the Governor; residence for the Governor; medical aid and support of the insane and of lepers and aid and support of indigent persons legally within the Canal Zone, including expenses of their deportation when practicable; and payments of not to exceed $50 in any one case to persons within the Government service who shall furnish blood for transfusions, $25,725,000. 72 Stat. 327.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For acquisition of land and land under water and acquisition, construction, and replacement of improvements, facilities, structures, and equipment, as authorized by law (2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 2; 2 C.Z. Code, Sec. 371), including the purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, of which seven are for police-type use without regard to the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; and expenses incident to the retirement of such assets; $6,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation under this head in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961, appropriations for "capital 76A Stat. 7, 26. 74 Stat. 827.

outlay" may be used for expenses related to the construction of quarters for non-U.S. citizen employees at a unit cost not exceeding $16,500.

PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

CORPORATION

The Panama Canal Company is hereby authorized to make such expenditures within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to it and in accordance with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 849), as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, except as hereinafter provided:

61 Stat. 584.

No real property or rights to the use of real property, or activity shall be disposed of or transferred by license, lease, or otherwise except to another agency of the United States Government unless specifically approved by the appropriate legislative committees of the House and Senate.

LIMITATION ON GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

Not to exceed $9,285,000 of the funds available to the Panama Canal Company shall be available during the current fiscal year for general and administrative expenses of the Company, including operation of tourist vessels and guide services, which shall be computed on an accrual basis. Funds available to the Panama Canal Company for operating expenses shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed sixteen passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one limousine at not to exceed $7,800 and for uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131).

68 Stat. 114.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THE PANAMA CANAL

The Governor of the Canal Zone is authorized to employ services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), in an amount not exceeding $30,000: *Provided*, That the rates for individuals shall not exceed $100 per diem.

60 Stat. 810.

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

For carrying out the functions of the Bureau of Reclamation as provided in the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) and other Acts applicable to that Bureau, as follows:

43 USC 371 note.

GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS

For engineering and economic investigations of proposed Federal reclamation projects and studies of water conservation and development plans and activities preliminary to the reconstruction, rehabilitation and betterment, financial adjustment, or extension of existing projects, including not to exceed $400,000 for investigations of projects in Alaska, to remain available until expended, $10,294,000, of which $8,902,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $500,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River development fund: *Pro-*

vided, That none of this appropriation shall be used for more than one-half of the cost of an investigation requested by a State, municipality, or other interest: *Provided further*, That $340,000 of this appropriation shall be transferred to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for studies, investigations, and reports thereon as required by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 563–565) to provide that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration and be coordinated with other features of water-resource development programs of the Bureau of Reclamation. 16 USC 661 note.

CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION

For construction and rehabilitation of authorized reclamation projects or parts thereof (including power transmission facilities) and for other related activities, as authorized by law, to remain available until expended, $185,431,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to initiate the construction of transmission facilities within those areas covered by power wheeling service contracts which include provision for service to Federal establishments and preferred customers, except those transmission facilities for which construction funds have been heretofore appropriated, those facilities which are necessary to carry out the terms of such contracts or those facilities for which the Secretary of the Interior finds the wheeling agency is unable or unwilling to provide for the integration of Federal projects or for service to a Federal establishment or preferred customer. Restriction.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof and of other facilities, as authorized by law; and for a soil and moisture conservation program on lands under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, pursuant to law, $38,000,000, of which $31,408,000 shall be derived from the reclamation fund and $1,645,000 shall be derived from the Colorado River Dam fund: *Provided*, That funds advanced for operation and maintenance of reclamation projects or parts thereof shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and may be expended for the same objects and in the same manner as sums appropriated herein may be expended, and the unexpended balances of such advances shall be credited to the appropriation for the next succeeding fiscal year.

LOAN PROGRAM

For loans to irrigation districts and other public agencies for construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects, and for loans and grants to non-Federal agencies for construction of projects, as authorized by the Acts of July 4, 1955, as amended (43 U.S.C. 421a–421d), and August 6, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 422a–422k), as amended (71 Stat. 48), including expenses necessary for carrying out the program, $12,367,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any contract under the Act of July 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 244), as amended, not yet executed by the Secretary, which calls for the making of loans beyond the fiscal year in which the contract is entered into shall be made only on the same conditions as those prescribed in section 12 of the Act of August 4, 1939 (53 Stat. 1187, 1197). 69 Stat. 244. 70 Stat. 1044. 43 USC 388.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

For the Upper Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by the Act of April 11, 1956 (43 U.S.C. 620d), to remain available until expended, $97,989,200, of which $94,036,700 shall be available for the "Upper Colorado River Basin Fund" authorized by section 5 of said Act of April 11, 1956, and $3,952,500 shall be available for construction of recreational and fish and wildlife facilities authorized by section 8 thereof, and may be expended by bureaus of the Department through or in cooperation with State or other Federal agencies, and advances to such Federal agencies are hereby authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for construction or operation of facilities to prevent waters of Lake Powell from entering any National Monument.

70 Stat. 107.
70 Stat. 110.
43 USC 620g.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of general administration and related functions in the offices of the Commissioner of Reclamation and in the regional offices of the Bureau of Reclamation, $10,000,000, to be derived from the reclamation fund and to be nonreimbursable pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377): *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation in this Act shall be available for activities or functions budgeted for the current fiscal year as general administrative expenses.

59 Stat. 54.

SPECIAL FUNDS

Sums herein referred to as being derived from the reclamation fund, the Colorado River Dam fund, or the Colorado River development fund, are appropriated from the special funds in the Treasury created by the Act of June 17, 1902 (43 U.S.C. 391), the Act of December 21, 1928 (43 U.S.C. 617a), and the Act of July 19, 1940 (43 U.S.C. 618a), respectively. Such sums shall be transferred, upon request of the Secretary, to be merged with and expended under the heads herein specified; and the unexpended balances of sums transferred for expenditure under the heads "Operation and Maintenance" and "General Administrative Expenses" shall revert and be credited to the special fund from which derived.

32 Stat. 388.
45 Stat. 1057;
54 Stat. 774.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations to the Bureau of Reclamation shall be available for purchase of not to exceed eighty-five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; purchase of one aircraft; payment of claims for damage to or loss of property, personal injury, or death arising out of activities of the Bureau of Reclamation; payment, except as otherwise provided for, of compensation and expense of persons on the rolls of the Bureau of Reclamation appointed as authorized by law to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts without reimbursement or return under the reclamation laws; rewards for information or evidence concerning violations of law involving property under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation; performance of the functions specified under the head "Operation and Maintenance Administration", Bureau of Reclamation, in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945; preparation and dissemination of useful information including recordings, photographs, and photographic prints; and studies of recreational uses of reservoir areas, and investigation and recovery of archeological and paleontological remains in such areas in the same manner as provided for in the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461–467): *Provided*,

58 Stat. 487.
49 Stat. 666.

That no part of any appropriation made herein shall be available pursuant to the Act of April 19, 1945 (43 U.S.C. 377), for expenses other than those incurred on behalf of specific reclamation projects except "General Administrative Expenses" and amounts provided for reconnaissance, basin surveys, and general engineering and research under the head "General Investigations". 59 Stat. 54.

Allotments to the Missouri River Basin project from the appropriation under the head "Construction and Rehabilitation" shall be available additionally for said project for those functions of the Bureau of Reclamation provided for under the head "General Investigations" (but this authorization shall not preclude use of the appropriation under said head within that area), and for the continuation of investigations by agencies of the Department on a general plan for the development of the Missouri River Basin. Such allotments may be expended through or in cooperation with State and other Federal agencies, and advances to such agencies are hereby authorized.

Sums appropriated herein which are expended in the performance of reimbursable functions of the Bureau of Reclamation shall be returnable to the extent and in the manner provided by law: *Provided*, That net revenues not to exceed $140,000 arising from the lease of grazing and agricultural lands within the Tule Lake and Lower Klamath Lake Divisions as determined by the Secretary may be credited to the cost heretofore and hereafter incurred for the Klamath project water rights program, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2(c) of the Act of June 17, 1944 and sections 2(a), 2(b), 2(c) of the Act of August 1, 1956. 58 Stat. 279. 70 Stat. 799.

No part of any appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation, contained in this Act or in any prior Act, which represents amounts earned under the terms of a contract but remaining unpaid, shall be obligated for any other purpose, regardless of when such amounts are to be paid: *Provided*, That the incurring of any obligation prohibited by this paragraph shall be deemed a violation of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665). 43 USC 612 note. Restrictions.

No funds appropriated to the Bureau of Reclamation for operation and maintenance, except those derived from advances by water users, shall be used for the particular benefits of lands (a) within the boundaries of an irrigation district, (b) of any member of a water users' organization, or (c) of any individual when such district, organization, or individual is in arrears for more than twelve months in the payment of charges due under a contract entered into with the United States pursuant to laws administered by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Not to exceed $225,000 may be expended from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" for work by force account on any one project or Missouri Basin unit and then only when such work is unsuitable for contract or no acceptable bid has been received and, other than otherwise provided in this paragraph or as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the construction allotment for any project from the appropriation "Construction and rehabilitation" contained in this Act shall be available for construction work by force account: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to work performed under the Rehabilitation and Betterment Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 724). Limitation. 43 USC 504 and note.

The amount of $241,160 shall be available from "Refunds and returns" for transfer to the Yuma County Water Users Association, representing the amount of credits accumulated as a reserve for depreciation and/or replacement of Siphon Drop powerplant, Yuma project, Arizona-California; this sum to be transferred to the Yuma County Water Users Association only after a contract providing for

the custody, use, or expenditure of said money and containing terms satisfactory to the Secretary has been entered into with said association.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, as authorized by law, $36,204,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of the Bonneville transmission system and of marketing electric power and energy, $13,500,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Appropriations of the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available to carry out all the duties imposed upon the Administrator pursuant to law. Appropriations made herein to the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available in one fund, except that the appropriation herein made for operation and maintenance shall be available only for the service of the current fiscal year.

Other than as may be necessary to meet local emergencies, not to exceed 12 per centum of the appropriation for construction herein made for the Bonneville Power Administration shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired-labor basis.

SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, $1,000,000.

58 Stat. 890.

SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

CONSTRUCTION

For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses connected therewith, in carrying out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, $3,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, including purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only, $1,500,000.

CONTINUING FUND

Not to exceed $4,500,000 shall be available during the current fiscal year from the continuing fund for all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy, and rentals for the use of transmission facilities.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

SEC. 201. Appropriations in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted. Emergency funds.

SEC. 202. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office) of any appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of forest or range fires on or threatening lands under jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Fire prevention.

SEC. 203. Appropriations in this title shall be available for operation of warehouses, garages, shops, and similar facilities, wherever consolidation of activities will contribute to efficiency or economy, and said appropriations shall be reimbursed for services rendered to any other activity in the same manner as authorized by the Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686): *Provided*, That reimbursements for costs of supplies, materials and equipment, and for services rendered may be credited to the appropriation current at the time such reimbursements are received. Operation of warehouses, etc. 47 Stat. 417.

SEC. 204. No part of any funds made available by this Act to the Southwestern Power Administration may be made available to any other agency, bureau, or office for any purposes other than for services rendered pursuant to law to the Southwestern Power Administration. Restriction.

TITLE III—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); hire, maintenance and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $30,000); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; hire of passenger motor vehicles; $2,342,669,000, and any moneys (except sums received from disposal of property under the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (42 U.S.C. 2301)) received by the Commission, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3617 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 484), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of such amount $100,000 may be expended for objects of a confidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient 68 Stat. 919. 42 USC 2011 note. 60 Stat. 810. 69 Stat. 471.

voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

PLANT AND CAPITAL EQUIPMENT

For expenses of the Commission, as authorized by law, in connection with the purchase and construction of plant and the acquisition of capital equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion; purchase (not to exceed four hundred and twenty-three for replacement only, including two at not to exceed $3,000 each) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; $400,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the obligated balance as of June 30, 1963, of amounts included in appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission for "Operating expenses", for capital equipment not related to construction, shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the unexpended balance as of June 30, 1963, of the appropriation "Plant acquisition and construction" shall be merged with this appropriation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $30,000,000 for a spectral shift power reactor may be transferred from this appropriation to the appropriation for "Operating expenses", if the Commission determines such transfer to be necessary to carry out such cooperative power reactor demonstration program as may be authorized by law.

68 Stat. 919.
42 USC 2011 note.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Any appropriation available under this or any other Act to the Atomic Energy Commission may initially be used subject to limitations in this Act during the fiscal year 1964 to finance the procurement of materials, services, or other costs which are a part of work or activities for which funds have been provided in any other appropriation available to the Commission: *Provided*, That appropriate transfers or adjustments between such appropriations shall subsequently be made for such costs on the basis of actual application determined in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.

Transfer of funds.

Not to exceed 5 per centum of appropriations made available for the fiscal year 1964 for "Operating expenses" and "Plant and capital equipment" may be transferred between such appropriations, but neither such appropriation, except as otherwise provided herein, shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfers, and any such transfers shall be reported promptly to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate.

Reports to congressional committees.

Restriction on fellowships.

No part of any appropriation herein shall be used to confer a fellowship on any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence or with respect to whom the Commission finds, upon investigation and report by the Civil Service Com-

mission on the character, associations, and loyalty of whom, that reasonable grounds exist for belief that such person is disloyal to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That any person who advocates or who is a member of an organization or party that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment or a fellowship the salary, wages, stipend, grant, or expenses for which are paid from any appropriation contained herein shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such Corporation, except as hereinafter provided: 61 Stat. 584. 31 USC 849.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Not to exceed $429,000 shall be available for administrative expenses which shall be computed on an accrual basis, including not to exceed $2,000 for official entertainment expenses to be expended upon the approval or authority of the Administrator, uniforms or allowances therefor for operation and maintenance personnel, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) at rates for individuals not to exceed $100 per day: *Provided*, That not to exceed $5,000 may be expended for services of individuals employed at rates in excess of $50 per day. 68 Stat. 1114. 60 Stat. 810.

Tennessee Valley Authority

PAYMENT TO TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FUND

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U.S.C., ch. 12A), including purchase (one for replacement only) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, and purchase (not to exceed one hundred and ninety for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $47,142,000, to remain available until expended. 48 Stat. 58.

Delaware River Basin Commission

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the functions of the United States member of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 716), $38,000.

CONTRIBUTION TO THE DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION

For payment of the United States share of the current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, as authorized by law (75 Stat. 706, 707), $117,000.

TITLE IV

Funds Appropriated to the President

PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION

For an additional amount for expenses necessary to enable the President to provide for carrying out the purposes of the Public Works Acceleration Act, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates for individuals not to exceed $75 per diem, $30,000,000.

76 Stat. 541.
42 USC 2641 note.
60 Stat. 810.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Departments, Agencies, and Corporations

Sec. 501. Unless otherwise specifically provided, the maximum amount allowable during the current fiscal year in accordance with section 16 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 78), for the purchase of any passenger motor vehicle (exclusive of buses and ambulances) is hereby fixed at $1,500 except station wagons for which the maximum shall be $1,950.

60 Stat. 810.

Sec. 502. Unless otherwise specified and during the current fiscal year, no part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Government of the United States (including any agency the majority of the stock of which is owned by the Government of the United States) whose post of duty is in continental United States unless such person (1) is a citizen of the United States, (2) is a person in the service of the United States on the date of enactment of this Act, who, being eligible for citizenship, had filed a declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States prior to such date, (3) is a person who owes allegiance to the United States, or (4) is an alien from Poland or the Baltic countries lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence: *Provided*, That for the purpose of this section, an affidavit signed by any such person shall be considered prima facie evidence that the requirements of this section with respect to his status have been complied with: *Provided further*, That any person making a false affidavit shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $4,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law: *Provided further*, That any payment made to any officer or employee contrary to the provisions of this section shall be recoverable in action by the Federal Government. This section shall not apply to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines or to nationals of those countries allied with the United States in the current defense effort, or to temporary employment of translators, or to temporary employment in the field service (not to exceed sixty days) as a result of emergencies.

Penalty.

Exception.

Sec. 503. Appropriations of the executive departments and independent establishments for the current fiscal year, available for expenses of travel or for the expenses of the activity concerned, are hereby made available for quarters allowances and cost-of-living allowances, in accordance with title II of the Act of September 6, 1960 (74 Stat. 793).

5 USC 3033-3038.

Sec. 504. No part of any appropriation for the current fiscal year contained in this or any other Act shall be paid to any person for the filling of any position for which he or she has been nominated after the Senate has voted not to approve the nomination of said person.

SEC. 505. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act for the current fiscal year shall be used to pay in excess of $4 per volume for the current and future volumes of the United States Code, Annotated, and such volumes shall be purchased on condition and with the understanding that latest published cumulative annual pocket parts issued prior to the date of purchase shall be furnished free of charge, or in excess of $4.25 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Lifetime Federal Digest, or in excess of $6.50 per volume for the current or future volumes of the Modern Federal Practice Digest.

SEC. 506. Funds made available by this or any other Act for administrative expenses in the current fiscal year of the corporations and agencies subject to the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 841), shall be available, in addition to objects for which such funds are otherwise available, for rent in the District of Columbia; services in accordance with section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and the objects specified under this head, all the provisions of which shall be applicable to the expenditure of such funds unless otherwise specified in the Act by which they are made available: *Provided*, That in the event any functions budgeted as administrative expenses are subsequently transferred to or paid from other funds, the limitations on administrative expenses shall be correspondingly reduced. 59 Stat. 597. 60 Stat. 810.

SEC. 507. Pursuant to section 1415 of the Act of July 15, 1952 (66 Stat. 662), foreign credits (including currencies) owed to or owned by the United States may be used by Federal agencies for any purpose for which appropriations are made for the current fiscal year (including the carrying out of Acts requiring or authorizing the use of such credits), only when reimbursement therefor is made to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That such credits received as exchange allowances or proceeds of sales of personal property may be used in whole or part payment for acquisition of similar items, to the extent and in the manner authorized by law, without reimbursement to the Treasury. 31 USC 724.

SEC. 508. During the current fiscal year, any foreign currencies held by the United States which have been or may be reserved or set aside for specified programs or activities of any agency may be carried on the books of the Treasury in unfunded accounts.

SEC. 509. No part of any appropriation contained in this or any other Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before Congress.

This Act may be cited as the "Public Works Appropriation Act, 1964". Short title.

Approved December 31, 1963.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY:

HOUSE REPORTS: No. 902 (Comm. on Appropriations), No. 1027 (Comm. of Conference).
SENATE REPORT No. 746 (Comm. on Appropriations).
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Vol. 109 (1963):
Nov. 19: Considered and passed House.
Dec. 9: Considered and passed Senate, amended.
Dec. 12: House agreed to conference report and concurred in Senate amendments.
Dec. 12: Senate agreed to conference report.